

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XIV

FEBRUARY, 1943

No. 2

Toward a Lutheran Philosophy of Education

II

The Historical and Educational Background Which the Philosophies of Education Presented in the *Yearbook* Body Forth

Were we asked: How did modern education arrive at its present status? we would reply that the answer to this query is not difficult to give, at least it is not difficult to register pertinent observations.

With respect to the Catholic Church and its interest in education it must be remembered that Loyola and his followers vigorously promoted Catholic education as a counter measure to the Reformation. The Catholic Church of that day was not interested in education for the sake of education, but it used this means as one among others to safeguard its interests. In only comparatively recent times did the Catholic Church begin to insist that the education of its constituency be left to the Church. Yet even today about fifty per cent of the Catholic youth is not educated in Catholic schools. With respect to factors which were directly or indirectly responsible for bringing about modern views in education, I shall call attention to some which Prof. E. H. Reisner most ably presents in the introductory chapter of the *Yearbook*. According to his analysis, the modern outlook on the world, which one finds reflected in philosophies of education, is due largely to factors such as these:

1. The scientific revolution since the Renaissance. This revolution broke away from the authority of the Church and ultimately from divine revelation itself and enthroned human reason.
2. The optimistic belief in human progress since the days of the Renaissance; men were beginning to believe that not faith and prayer, but science was the means to control poverty, disease, famine, war, and political tyranny.

3. Men had broken away from the medieval position of *contemptus mundi* and had engaged in the undertaking (a precarious undertaking indeed!) to establish the kingdom of God on earth.
4. The skepticism of great thinkers from the days of Hobbes down to the present day.
5. The idealistic detour, a detour from a crass materialism which had settled down on France at the close of the 18th century, but a detour also which produced such idealistic thinkers as Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, T. H. Greene, Froebel, Felix Adler, Josiah Royce, and W. T. Harris, for whom the world was at best no more than an objectivation of the Absolute.
6. The popularization of the evolutionary theory, which did away with a limited 6,000 years since the creation of the world and extended time to billions of years.
7. The doctrine that matter is not dead stuff, as Aristotle held, but electric energy (Ostwald).
8. The doctrine that man's mind, in common with that of animals, is a biological phenomenon performing a biological function; it is better than that of animals, but not intrinsically different; it is purely a means of contact of an organism with the environment which produces knowledge (thus did materialism cut the Gordian knot in epistemology, the problem of how we acquire knowledge). For a clear statement of the relation of modern materialism to the problem of knowledge we refer the reader to an article by Paul Weiss titled "Cosmic Behaviorism" in the *Philosophical Review* (July, 1942).
9. The good is scientifically applied conduct.
10. There is no reality beyond the world of experience (materialism, some forms of naturalism, experimentalism).
11. The scientist is not interested in the problem of being (causes), but only in an analysis and description of experience, especially the problem of knowing and conduct—truth and goodness.

Admitting all these factors, which, according to Professor Reiser, have largely determined the outlook of modern philosophies of education and allowing still others, such as the impact on Western civilization of the doctrine of economic determinism, the rise and decline of the capitalistic system, the penetration of the applied sciences into all nooks of the American way of life, the expansion of American education culminating in mass and compulsory education, and the cancerous growth of international complications, it cannot be denied that major implications inherent in present-day philosophies of education would not have exerted so powerful an influence, had there not been brilliant minds whose range and depth encompassed many of these factors and appreciated their significance for education and the philosophy of education. There were, and still are, such minds. One need but think

of William James, William C. Bagley, Charles A. Judd, Edward L. Thorndike, Franklin Bobbitt, George S. Counts, Boyd H. Bode, Harold Rugg, and others. But the one man who, as it were, gathered up into the prism of his mind practically every colorful light wave of the present era in human history is Prof. John Dewey. It has come to pass that modern philosophies of education are either very largely implicit in, and explicit of, Professor Dewey's outlook, or they express more or less reactionary moods. Experimentalism, which finds its most ardent disciples in various schools of "Progressivism," claims Professor Dewey as its spiritual father. Realism, to the extent that it stresses the scientific outlook, is rooted in Professor Dewey; to the extent that it insists on *the principle of independence*, it is at variance with Professor Dewey. Idealism, to the extent that it has taken over techniques and procedures from experimentalism, is greatly indebted to Professor Dewey; to the extent that it condemns materialistic strains inherent in pragmatism, it opposes Professor Dewey. Aristotelianism, because of its belief in absolute principles, is at present perhaps the most pronounced reactionary mood to Professor Dewey's pragmatism. Scholasticism, inasmuch as it approves of such aspects of experimentalism as do not interfere with the ultimate objective of Catholic education, is under obligation to Professor Dewey; inasmuch as it stresses rational as well as divinely revealed principles, it sets its teeth against Professor Dewey. If the bulk and range of an author's literary productions is one index of that person's influence, then Professor Dewey's views have had a singularly wide and potent bearing on American as well as European thought. In Prof. Paul A. Schilpp's outstanding work titled *The Philosophy of John Dewey*, an incomplete list of Professor Dewey's books and articles covers sixty-five pages, and in *Who's Who in Philosophy* (1942) a bare enumeration of Professor Dewey's publications fills eleven double-column pages.

What are Professor Dewey's views on education? In my attempt to summarize them, I am guided largely by Prof. Robert L. Cooke's able analysis of Professor Dewey's doctrines in his *Philosophy, Education, and Certainty* (1940), a work which received the written commendation of Professor Dewey himself (see *The Sunday School Times*, June 7, 1941, p. 459).

1. Professor Dewey took over from William James the doctrine of pragmatism, which Woodbridge Riley exalts as "the philosophy of practicality, the gospel of energy, whose prime criterion is success," and this he developed and applied directly to education. It should be noted that pragmatism is rooted in, and draws its arguments and analogies from, evolution. In accounting for the difference between true and false, right and wrong, good and bad,

beautiful and ugly, pragmatism is in effect employing the Darwinian notions of spontaneous variation and the struggle for survival.

2. Professor Dewey, following in the footsteps of Pestalozzi and Froebel, stresses activity, doing by learning. According to him, all learning must come to the child solely as a by-product of his experience in school and out and is never something to be learned directly and for its own sake.

3. Professor Dewey developed the doctrine of reflective (scientific) thinking. This he took over directly from the scientific method. Ideas are instruments of integration, continuity, and survival. Education is the instrument by which the developing and changing personality of the growing child may be integrated and facilitated.

4. According to Professor Dewey, the course of study should be oriented toward the world of the present rather than the past, and only in a limited degree toward the future.

5. External discipline is taboo with Professor Dewey, though he vigorously condemns "easy learning."

6. Professor Dewey opposes the program of vocationalists; he stresses that type of activity which aids *mental growth*.

7. According to Professor Dewey, mind and intelligence have evolved through the centuries in the process of the interaction of the organism with the environment in its various physical and social aspects and the application of the lessons of experience; thus the possibilities of change through growth are unlimited. Knowledge is the result, and not the guide, of an action (behaviorism).

8. Professor Dewey emphasizes the powers inherent in modern science and in reason. He believes that science will eventually control all of nature and that intelligence can do away with evils once thought inevitable. To subjugate devastating disease is no longer a dream; the hope of abolishing poverty is not Utopian. Science has familiarized men with the idea of development, taking effect practically in persistent gradual amelioration of the estate of our common humanity. The problem of an educational use of science is then to create an intelligence pregnant with belief in the possibility of the direction of human affairs by itself.

9. With respect to aims and objectives, Professor Dewey believes that there is no such thing as a fixed and final set of objectives, even for the time being. Each day of teaching ought to enable the teacher to revise and better in some respect the objectives aimed at in previous work.

10. Professor Dewey advocates that schools place major emphasis not on the basic sciences, but on the social sciences in their most active and immediate aspects. Physics and chemistry, so he believes, lead the student away from the concrete realities of experience to a systematic realm of symbolic abstractions, whereas sociology and psychology familiarize the student with human experience as it is actually experienced, in all its concreteness as well as in its fragmentariness.

11. Professor Dewey sponsors a new social order. He is definitely dissatisfied with the present order. He is opposed to the division between laboring classes and leisure classes. At one time he was interested in a projected new national political party. He was among the first to promote teachers' unions and sponsored an agreement between these unions with industrial unions.

12. The following quotations will throw light on Professor Dewey's religious views:

The sinfulness of man, the corruption of his heart, his self-love, and love of power, when referred to as causes are precisely of the same nature as was the appeal to abstract powers that once prevailed in physical science and that operated as a chief obstacle to the generation and growth of the latter (*A Common Faith*, 1934, p. 77).

Similar statements are quoted by Professor Cooke in his article "What Is Wrong with American Education?" (*The Sunday School Times*, June 7, 1941, p. 460). Some of them are:

The idea of the sinfulness of man, the corruption of his heart, is a retarding force hindering progress and offering the chief obstacle to the development of social intelligence. . . .

The idea of mere individual salvation of individual souls is a denial of the possibility of rational operation of intelligence in the conduct of human life. . . .

Faith in God, in authority, ideas of souls and immortality, belief in divine grace . . . have been made impossible for the educated mind today. . . .

For further study of Professor Dewey's religious views, I refer to my tract *The Lutheran Elementary School, an Interpretation*.

In the light of this brief analysis of Professor Dewey's thought it should be evident that modern philosophies of education are deeply grounded in his views. Professor Cooke is right when he says, "It is no exaggeration to say that the entire present-day picture of education centers about Dewey, his ideas, and the developments leading from his ideas" (*op. cit.*, p. 167). Experimentalism took most kindly to him, other philosophies less kindly, but none could escape the impact of his thought. It is self-evident therefore that also a Lutheran philosophy of education will have

to take issue with Professor Dewey and his influence on modern education.

We have concluded our story of the historical and educational background which the philosophies of education presented in the *Yearbook* body forth. We shall now venture to suggest basic considerations of a Lutheran philosophy of education.

III

Theory of a Lutheran Philosophy of Education

Among many questions which arise in our mind when we inquire into the nature of a Lutheran philosophy of education the following seem to be most relevant: What areas and aspects of the educative process come under the purview of a Lutheran philosophy of education? What is the content of a Lutheran philosophy of education? What is its foundation? What ought a Lutheran philosophy of education try to do? And how does it achieve its ends? We shall, therefore, in this final chapter examine the following aspects of a Lutheran philosophy of education: 1. its scope; 2. its content; 3. its aims and objectives; and 4. its methods and means.

1. Scope of a Lutheran Philosophy of Education

A Lutheran philosophy of education takes into account *all* areas and aspects of the educative process. Organization and content of the curriculum, methods, educational psychology, child psychology, educational science, individual differences, classroom organization and management, tests and measurements, administration, finances, and other factors related to education come under the jurisdiction of a Lutheran philosophy of education.

Let me illustrate. Lutheran education—I am thinking now in terms of education as it is carried on in our Church—embraces *all age levels*. We seek to provide education for the pre-adolescent child, the adolescent youth, and the matured adult. Furthermore, a glance at the curriculums operative in our schools reveals that we conduct *various types of schools*. Our parish schools teach those fundamental subjects and develop those basic skills and habits which are requisite for more advanced study. Our secondary schools provide a pre-liberal-arts training or prepare for a commercial or an engineering career, or for other vocations. Our university at Valparaiso conducts a college of liberal arts, a college of law, and a college of engineering. Courses offered in our pre-theological schools are oriented in the direction of preparing students for the study of theology. Our seminaries at Springfield and St. Louis equip young men for the multifarious tasks of the Christian ministry. Our teachers' colleges train young men and women for service in our parishes as teachers, as organists and

choir directors, and as leaders of young people's groups. We also conduct part-time agencies of religious education such as vacation Bible schools and Saturday schools. Finally, though we naturally tend to conceive of education in terms of *institutions*—parish schools, secondary schools, university, pre-theological schools, seminaries, teachers' colleges—we must bear in mind that we have with us *non-institutional education*, that is, education carried on in the home. Unfortunately, we are not always conscious of this fact and do not always seem to appreciate its vast significance. This may be the reason, too, why we have made no more than a fair beginning in the way of providing suitable educational materials for the Christian parent (though individuals in our circles are performing noble service in this fertile field) and for the Christian adult whose formal education has terminated perhaps many years ago. The scope of Lutheran education, therefore, of which a philosophy of Lutheran education must take account, embraces *every age level, every type of School, and includes both institutional and non-institutional education.*

2. Content of a Lutheran Philosophy of Education

In my effort to define the content of a Lutheran philosophy of education I am following the lead suggested by Professor Adler. He believes that the content of the philosophy of education is *knowledge* (as opposed to *opinion*) and that this knowledge consists in *principles*. Similarly, I conceive the content of a Lutheran philosophy of education to be *knowledge, knowledge of the principles* which govern, or should govern, the entire process and system of Lutheran education. I hold this knowledge to be the content of a Lutheran philosophy of education because my analyses of the philosophies of education represented in the *Yearbook* and of other philosophies of education have persuaded me that substitution of any other content degrades the philosophy of education to a hopeless *mélange* of opinions sometimes expressive of totally unrelated aspects of education.

A Lutheran philosopher of education must, therefore, meticulously guard against confusing principles of his philosophy with private opinions. He must, furthermore, not speak with the voice of authority when no principle is involved or when no principle exists. A Lutheran psychologist, let us say, or a Lutheran administrator of education, or an experienced Lutheran teacher must not pose as an educational philosopher (make an opinion appear as a principle) when he is merely voicing opinion. It will readily be seen that much confusion in our educational thinking results from the tragic fact that the philosopher of education expresses an opinion whereas he should have spoken with the

voice of authority (stated a principle) and that the practitioner poses as a philosopher of education whereas he is rendering no more than an opinion. Such confusion is fraught with great danger. It easily leads to misunderstanding, dissension, bitterness, and estrangement, and impedes the wholesome progress of the educative process.

The difficulty which arises from confusing principles with opinions (and vice versa) can be overcome, at least approximately, in an educational system as limited in scope as ours. Indeed, more centralization of authority and greater co-ordination of effort may be necessary. We can, to use an illustration, well conceive of a synodical committee on education being so constituted that it will consist, on the one hand, of experts in the knowledge of principles and, on the other hand, of experts in opinions, such as administrators, educational psychologists, educational scientists, and experienced teachers can render. Such a committee would study all phases of our educational system, be guided by unalterable *principles*, agree on the basis of majority vote on *opinions*, and submit its reports in terms of principles and opinions. Perhaps such a committee is Utopian, perhaps it would have to be vested with more authority than Americans ordinarily grant their leaders, but it would function more successfully than committees constituted of individuals expert neither in knowledge nor in opinion. What I have said about the constituency of such a synodical committee on education would, of course, hold, *pari passu*, of every other committee in our circles entrusted with matters of education.

We inquire next: What are the sources from which these principles are derived? Or what is the foundation of the knowledge which constitutes the content of a Lutheran philosophy of education? It will be remembered that experimentalism, realism, and idealism recognize two sources of knowledge, science and reason, though types of religious idealism look for support of some of their principles to divine revelation. Professor Adler, who recognizes science and reason as sources of knowledge, is assured, however, that "religious education rests on supernatural knowledge, the ultimate source of which is Divine Revelation" (p. 220). Scholasticism has an undue veneration for reason as a source of knowledge without, however, disparaging assured results of science. It goes to divine revelation for many of its principles.

A Lutheran philosophy of education draws its principles from three sources, divine revelation, reason, and science, the primary one being divine revelation. In problematic situations it always seeks to determine whether divine revelation has laid down a universal principle. Discovery of such a principle determines its course of action. If divine revelation does not disclose a principle,

a Lutheran philosophy of education resorts to secondary sources such as postulates of reason and findings of science.

When we speak of "principles" derived from reason and science, we do not mean to imply that these principles are absolute in the same sense in which divinely revealed principles are absolute. They are rather tentatively held principles. Examples of such principles would be: "The earth is round" and "Two and two are four." By maintaining the validity of these principles we oppose skepticism, which questions the truth of every principle, as well as agnosticism, which denies all truth. We hold to the position that in our most common experiences sensations do not deceive us and that things are as they appear to the senses and as reason thinks of them. Yes, we thank God that He permits man by means of his reason and by means of experimental science to discover and explore many truths which He has not revealed in His Word. At the same time we profoundly regret that since the Fall, in particular since the days of the great Greek thinkers, man has frequently believed in the unerring judgment of reason and in the ultimacy of experimental science. History clearly demonstrates that even in the solution of very simple problems that surround man in his daily life the profoundest researches of reason and science have frequently failed. We feel genuinely sorry for exponents of experimentalism and other philosophies, including scholasticism, who in spite of the many wrecks of rationalizations and "assured" scientific findings strewn along the highway of history still hold to the ultimacy of reason and to the firm belief that science can and will solve all problems lying not only in the realm of nature, but in the realm of human relationships as well. To the extent, however, that principles derived from reason or science are tentatively firmly established a Lutheran philosopher of education builds them into the texture of his philosophy, always remembering, however, that he must never permit them to trespass on holy ground and that further researches by reason and science may call for drastic revisions of these principles.

We inquire further: What are these principles which a Lutheran philosophy of education finds in divine revelation? We shall not attempt to present all of them. We shall call attention at this point only to those which are of particular relevance in the educative process.

With respect to knowledge of God, divine revelation acknowledges a natural knowledge of God (Rom. 1:19, 20; Ps. 19:1). But divine revelation is equally clear in saying that this natural knowledge of God is incomplete. It reveals many truths regarding the nature of God and His relation to the universe which reason and experimental science cannot of themselves discover. It reveals,

for instance, that God sent His Son into the world to save sinners from sin, death, and hell, and that whoever believes in the incarnate Son of God, Jesus Christ, as his Savior, will be eternally saved and that he who does not believe in Jesus Christ as his Savior will be eternally damned. It reveals many other truths about God on which we need not dwell at this time. The point is that the Lutheran philosopher of education draws his principles regarding the nature of God and regarding God's relation to man from divine revelation and is not satisfied with the highly fragmentary knowledge of God which reason or science discloses.

With respect to the universe divine revelation teaches that God created this universe by His almighty Word. In the entire Bible there is not the slightest evidence that this universe evolved even though since the days of the Greeks human reason has frequently found it convenient to postulate the gradual evolution of the universe. Divine revelation also teaches that this universe will be destroyed even though human reason has at times found it agreeable to believe in an eternal and changeless universe or in a Nietzschean doctrine of "eternal recurrence."

With respect to man divine revelation is most explicit. God created man according to His own image. Man is not a brute. Professor Brubacher legitimately poses the observation: "The significance of this difference (that man is not a brute) is that man with his rational nature can be educated while the brute without it is capable only of being trained. What such a distinction would mean for inferences drawn from animal experimentation as to human learning can easily be imagined" (p. 306). Divine revelation also teaches that man whom God created in perfect knowledge of God and in perfect holiness fell into sin and by his sin corrupted not only himself but also all of his descendants. Man, as he is born of woman, is thoroughly corrupt according to body, soul, and mind. Divine revelation knows nothing of a supernature of which Adam and his descendants were deprived after Adam's fall. This teaching of scholasticism is a fiction of erring human reason. Divine revelation rejects the teaching of Rousseau and his disciples, including many "progressives," that "man is perfect as he comes from the hand of his Creator." Divine revelation knows nothing of the teaching of other thinkers that man is born amoral, neither good nor bad, having potentialities, however, toward good or evil. Divine revelation rather teaches that man is born with predispositions not toward good, but only toward evil and that these evil propensities soon express themselves in sinful attitudes, desires, thoughts, words, and deeds. Divine revelation, furthermore, makes it clear that unregenerate man, in so far as he still leads a decent life, respects the rights of others and the authorities placed over

him, and proves himself a useful citizen, does this as a result of the fact that there still is operative in him the divine voice of the Moral Law which God had written into Adam's heart (Rom. 2:14, 15). For that reason we can well appreciate the "ought" in the Kantian ethics and we marvel at the lofty heights to which other idealistic ethical systems have frequently aspired. But divine revelation shows that man can never by the observance of the Law still operative in his heart satisfy God and merit His good will and pleasure, much less eternal salvation.

These, then, are some of the principles inherent in the content of a Lutheran philosophy of education. Their source is divine revelation. All principles derived from this source are changeless and timeless. They are absolute truths, truths which reason and science can gratuitously disclaim but can never discredit and disqualify.

3. Aims and Objectives of a Lutheran Philosophy of Education

At the outset of my discussion of aims of a Lutheran philosophy of education I wish to emphasize that I am not now referring to aims and objectives of Lutheran education, but to aims of a Lutheran philosophy of education. Immediate aims and objectives of any area in the vast field of education must be determined by administrators, teachers, educational psychologists, educational scientists, groups (usually the faculty) that set up the curriculum, and other responsible officers. These aims and objectives lie for the most part in the field of opinion, and opinion, as we have seen, does not share in the content of a Lutheran philosophy of education. It may indeed be difficult at times to determine whether a given instance involves a principle derived from divine revelation or from established data of reason and science or an opinion pre-scinded from a limited number of like cases. The only God-pleasing way of solving such problems is the application by all concerned of the law of Christian charity. Ordinarily a Lutheran philosophy of education enters on the scene only when it finds it necessary to say that immediate aims and objectives must be in harmony with, and seek to promote, the aims and objectives of a Lutheran philosophy of education.

But what are these aims and objectives? They are, in brief, the sincere endeavor of all who are engaged in some way or other in the task of Lutheran education to draw up, as far as this is humanly possible, the principles of a Lutheran philosophy of education and a comprehensive body of expert opinion on educational matters.

Inasmuch however as these principles are very largely identical with the ultimate aims and objectives of all Lutheran education

and constitute the very *raison d'être* of Lutheran education, it will not be regarded amiss if I state them:

They are the following four: 1. promotion of respect for the individual; 2. promotion of faith life; 3. promotion of spiritual and moral life; 4. promotion of physical, intellectual, and emotional life.

A Lutheran philosophy of education insists that everyone engaged in some way or other in the task of Lutheran education recognize that human society is not an indiscriminate mass resembling a Platonic idea, but an aggregate of individual human beings. It is frequently said in our day that the basic difference between democracy and totalitarianism is this: Democracy recognizes the dignity and rights of the individual, whereas totalitarianism regards the individual merely as a means to an end, the end being the State. Unfortunately, however, this evaluation of the individual is frequently no more than a catchword, a shibboleth, intended to define what we are fighting for and to be shelved and forgotten as soon as the war is over. But the fact is, according to divine revelation, that every individual does count for something. Every individual has an immortal soul, for which Jesus spilled His life's blood. It follows that everyone engaged in the task of Lutheran education recognize this principle, and whether he be administrator, teacher, or perform other service in the interest of Lutheran education strive to promote this divinely revealed principle. From the point of view of divine revelation it makes no difference whether a child or student has an average or low or high I. Q., whether he is a perfect specimen of health or whether he is afflicted with some physical handicap. It makes no difference whether an individual belongs to the privileged or the underprivileged group, and whether he is white or black, yellow or red.

Furthermore, a Lutheran philosophy of education seeks to promote the faith life of all who are being educated in the Lutheran system of education. The greatest privilege which anyone engaged in Lutheran education enjoys is to contribute on his part to the development of the faith life of those who are being educated by him. We dislike shibboleths such as "child-centered," "society-centered," "integration," and others because, as we have already indicated, they easily lend themselves to oversimplification and false emphasis. But there is one shibboleth which ought to resound throughout our education system. This shibboleth is "Christ-centered." Lutheran education should be "Christ-centered," not, first of all, in the sense that Christ be held up to our pupils and students as the Great Teacher or the paragon of virtue, but that He was crucified for the sins of the world; "Christ-centered" in the sense in which Paul thought of Christ when he wrote, "I am determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and

Him crucified" (1 Cor. 2:2). This unspeakable truth that Christ was crucified and died for the sins of all mankind must, as I have written elsewhere, "be the basis of all instruction in religion, the terminus to which the Christian educator must ever and again direct the thought and activity of his pupils or students . . . the point of vantage from which he is able to evaluate correctly all knowledge made available by reason and scientific investigation."

A Lutheran philosophy of education seeks to promote also the spiritual and moral life of the pupil and the student. It indeed recognizes the value of character training which is carried on in Bibleless, Godless, and Christless systems of education of our day. But it maintains that the individual is able to lead a God-pleasing spiritual and moral life only as a result of the operation of the Holy Spirit on his heart and that only to the extent that he reads and meditates on God's Word and attends Holy Communion will his spiritual and moral life be deepened and improved. Therefore a Lutheran philosophy of education disavows the sufficiency of Aristotelian ethics which makes happiness the highest good, even though Aristotle had in mind happiness achieved by virtuous activity. It regards as insufficient also Kantian ethics, which rest on the principle of duty for duty's sake. It opposes utilitarian and all naturalistic ethics, which ultimately are inspired by considerations of temporal rewards and punishments. It rather insists on the application of the ethics which rest on those absolute principles laid down by God Himself in His inspired revelation. It strives to stimulate the spiritual and moral life of its pupils and students by repeated reference to the love of God in Christ Jesus and to the need of studying God's Word and frequently partaking of Holy Communion.

A Lutheran philosophy of education seeks, finally, to promote the physical, intellectual, and emotional life of all who are educated in the Lutheran scheme of education. I take the liberty to repeat here what I have written elsewhere: "Since the secular activity of a Christian does not constitute a life apart from his Christianity, a Lutheran philosophy of education not only allows for, but also imposes on, the Christian educator and others instrumental in the educational process of our Church the duty and responsibility adequately to prepare pupils and students for their life on earth. All those engaged in the educative process must aim to safeguard and improve the physical health of their pupils, to sharpen their intellect, to stimulate their emotional life, to direct their will, to discover and to develop native skills and interests, and to enrich their minds and memories with knowledge indispensable for successful living in this world and with a deep appreciation of the culture which past ages have bequeathed to the present generation."

4. Methods and Means of a Lutheran Philosophy of Education

We have noted that the content of a Lutheran philosophy of education are those absolute principles, those "fixed stars" implicit in divine revelation, as well as those established truths which reason and science make available. We have also examined the aims and objectives of a Lutheran philosophy of education and have discovered that these aims and objectives are very largely identical with the ultimate educational aims of all who are engaged in Lutheran education. We inquire, finally: By what methods and by what means does a Lutheran philosophy of education hope to achieve its aims and objectives?

The caution is again in place that we are not now concerned with methods and means which, for example, the practitioner in the teaching profession employs in order to achieve his aims. Whatever methods a teacher, whether he is teaching in the kindergarten or in the grades or in the secondary school, in a pretheological school or in other Lutheran schools, employs must be left to his discretion. The choice of methods by the teacher, the administrator, and others engaged directly or indirectly in the educative process belongs, by and large, not into the field of principles, but into the field of opinion. That consideration alone ought be sufficient to warn overenthusiastic teachers of method against exalting some methods to such heights that students will be apt to regard them as fixed principles. To be sure—if we are allowed to continue this digression—a teacher should be constantly alert to ascertain what reason and scientific experiment have discovered by way of achieving quicker, easier, and surer results through the application of different, if not new, methods. But he must never overrate methods at the expense of those principles which constitute the content of a Lutheran philosophy of education and which he must strive to realize above every other consideration.

In order to achieve the aims and objectives of a Lutheran philosophy of education, it goes without saying that everyone responsible for Lutheran education must himself believe in these principles, strive to gain a firmer grasp of them, and in his daily conduct reflect his allegiance to these principles, whether he happens to be on or off the schoolground or campus. He must, furthermore, make it his business that these principles find expression in publicity efforts, such as school catalogs, school papers, posters, sermons, addresses, and the like. He must also keep an ever-watchful eye on the curriculum. This must clearly reflect the school's aims to promote the faith life, the spiritual and moral life, and the physical, intellectual, and emotional life of its pupils or students. Necessarily, therefore, the Word of God must occupy a prominent place in the curriculum. May I add, in passing, that

the Word of God must permeate the entire life of a Lutheran school. Students, teachers, and administrators must study it systematically in private. In fact, one would expect that at least the interior decoration of every Lutheran school symbolize by means of murals, famous paintings, and inscriptions Biblical stories and truths.

Finally, since many principles of a Lutheran philosophy of education are abstracted from reason and science, it goes without saying that everyone engaged in teaching and in administrative work in any one of our schools should be thoroughly familiar with his field of interest. Our teachers of the common branches, our teachers of mathematics, psychology, sociology, history, languages, the fine arts, the basic and natural sciences, and other subjects ought know their respective fields exceptionally well. Are they not continually abstracting from these areas of knowledge principles which form part of the content of their Lutheran philosophy of education? Are they not frequently called on to render expert opinions?

We have now completed our analysis of a Lutheran philosophy of education. We recognize painfully that we have left many questions unanswered and many problems unsolved. For this reason we have not titled our essay "A Lutheran Philosophy of education" but "*Toward a Lutheran Philosophy of Education.*" We believe, however, that, with the help of brethren in the field, it should not be impossible to formulate, on the one hand, a set of those principles which constitute the content of a Lutheran philosophy of education and, on the other hand, a fairly comprehensive set of expert opinions. When this goal has been realized, we shall have moved far away from a nebulous *toward a* philosophy of Lutheran education and be headed in a straight course toward *the* Lutheran philosophy of education.

"And being now at some pause," as Francis Bacon said when he had finished writing a book, "looking back into that I have passed through, this writing seemeth to me (as far as a man can judge of his own work) not much better than the noise or sound which musicians make while they are tuning their instruments; which is nothing pleasant to hear, but yet is a cause why the music is sweeter afterwards."

St. Louis, Mo., August 31, 1942

PAUL BRETSCHER



Study on 2 Cor. 3:12-18

Eisenach Epistle Selection for the Sixth Sunday after Epiphany

In an outburst of triumphant joy Paul had thanked God for the marvelous successes granted to the Gospel as preached by him and his associates, successes which far surpassed the power of man, 2:16b, successes which he does not ascribe to himself or mention in a spirit of self-glorification, 3:1. These successes are due only to the power of the Spirit of the living God, v. 3, and to the means used by the Spirit in gaining these successes, the Gospel as preached by the ministers of the New Testament, v. 6. This Gospel makes the ministry of the New Testament far more glorious than that of the Old Covenant (vv. 7-11) and empowers the ministers of the New Testament to preach their glad tidings of great joy with proper boldness and utter frankness (vv. 12-18), with unflinching courage (4:1), in holiness of life (4:2), with the assurance that their Gospel will never be void of success (4:3-6). The Epistle for the Sixth Sunday after Epiphany comprises verses 12-18, the closing section of the third chapter, telling of the glory bestowed by the open, unveiled ministry of the New Testament.

"Seeing, then, that we have such hope, we use great plainness of speech," v. 12. In v. 4 the apostle had used the word *trust*, because he was speaking of his assurance that his work had not been in vain, that the Christian congregation at Corinth was the living proof of the efficacy of his preaching. In v. 12 Paul uses the word *hope*, which always looks forward into the future. Hence he has in mind particularly the fact that his ministry is an abiding ministry. While the Old Covenant and its glory was by its very nature an evanescent one, destined to cease, when it should have fulfilled its purpose, the New Covenant was one "which remaineth," v. 11, continuing in its glory forever without variableness or shadow of turning. The New Testament era is not to be superseded by a ministry still more glorious, as, *e. g.*, that of a millennium on earth, where even greater successes will be accomplished by more efficacious means or a greater manifestation of God's grace or power. The ministry of the New Testament shall endure until there is no more need of the ministry of the Gospel; until its purpose to lead all the elect of God to their eternal home has been accomplished; until the Kingdom of Grace, the kingdom of the New Covenant on earth, shall have become the Kingdom of Glory, the kingdom of the New Covenant in heaven. The New Covenant in contradistinction to the Old Covenant is an abiding covenant, outlasting time, enduring through all eternities.

Having this hope, a hope of this nature, so glorious an outlook, the Apostle uses great "plainness of speech," *παρρησία*, tell-

ing all, withholding nothing, keeping nothing secret, but speaking with great frankness, openness. He "uses" this frankness. The use of a thing presupposes its existence, and particularly on the part of God's servant, divine permission of such use. The Apostle means to say that his use of frankness is due not only to divine permission but to the very nature of the New Covenant, which is a covenant of openness and full revelation, in contrast to the Old Testament as symbolized by a custom of its mediator. This custom Paul describes in the next verse, which has been often misinterpreted, but which, once we understand it correctly, will throw a remarkable light on the subject matter discussed by the Apostle.

"And not as Moses, which put a veil over his face that the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished," v. 13. In order to understand this verse and the whole argumentation of the Apostle, we must necessarily understand the situation to which he refers here. Turning to Ex. 34:28-35, we learn that Moses, after having re-established the covenant which Israel had broken, Ex. 32 to 34:27, remained with the Lord on the summit of Mount Sinai forty days and forty nights, v. 28. Coming down from the mountain, he did not know that the skin of his face shone because he had spoken with the Lord. Aaron and all the people, upon seeing the supermundane glory of Moses' face, were afraid to come near him, and only after Aaron and the rulers, encouraged by Moses, had approached him without harm to themselves, did all the children of Israel dare to draw near, "and he gave them in commandment all that the Lord had spoken with him in Mount Sinai," v. 32, quite evidently while they saw his shining face. Then the report continues, literally translated, thus: "And Moses finished speaking to them, and he placed upon his face a veil. And as often as Moses came into the presence of Jehovah to speak to Him, he removed the veil until he went out. And he went out and spoke to the children of Israel what he had been commanded; and the children of Israel saw the face of Moses, that the skin of Moses' face shone. And Moses replaced the veil upon his face till he went to speak to Him," vv. 33-35. There is nothing in this report demanding or even warranting the interpretation that Moses covered his face before speaking to the people and that he proclaimed the laws and revelations only while his face was veiled. On the contrary, we are told twice that the people saw the shining skin, vv. 30, 35. In v. 33 we are clearly told that he put the veil on his face when he had finished speaking to them, while in vv. 34, 35 the sequence of events is Moses' exit, his speech while they saw that his face shone, and the covering of his face. Hence the phrase "until he came out," v. 34, merely states that during all the time of his conversation with God, Moses left

his face uncovered, with uncovered face promulgated the divine revelation, and then placed the veil upon his face.

No reason for this veiling is mentioned in the Old Testament. What the Holy Ghost, speaking through Moses, did not tell us, the same Spirit, speaking through Paul, reveals in our passage. Moses covered his face, after speaking to the Israelites with uncovered face, in order that "the children of Israel could not steadfastly look to the end of that which is abolished," that they were not to look intently, fix their eyes, on the end of that which was being done away with, annulled, which was of a transitory nature, evanescent, the supernatural light radiating forth from the skin of his face.

What was the divine purpose underlying this strange phenomenon? Comparing Ex. 34:29-35 with 2 Cor. 3:6-18, we come to the conclusion that here we have one of the symbols so frequently employed by the Lord in training and teaching His Old Testament people. Both the supernatural shining of Moses' face and the vanishing of this glory were to teach a lesson of utmost importance to Israel, the glory of the Old Testament Covenant and the evanescent character of this covenant and its glory.

The shining face of Moses was, in the first place, continually to call to Israel's memory the glory of the covenant which God had established on Sinai and the exalted position of him who had been chosen by God to be the mediator of this covenant and the leader and legislator of God's covenant people. God wanted Israel to be imbued with the spirit of respectful awe due this covenant, its divine Author, its human mediator. They were to understand very clearly that Moses was not a self-appointed leader nor a ruler chosen by themselves, but God's ordained representative. God wanted them to realize their unconditional obligation to obey all the words and commandments of this covenant transmitted to them by the divinely and gloriously authorized mediator, who spoke not his own thoughts, but the words of the Lord of Glory.

This was the first lesson that Israel was to learn and a lesson they had to be taught over and over. True, the promise of God, Ex. 19:3-6, had made them willing to vow: Ex. 19:8. The majestic manifestation of God's glory on Sinai, Ex. 19:16-19; Deut. 4:11. 12; Heb. 12:18-21, had proved to them the transcendent power and flawless righteousness of the Lord, so that, stricken with fear and terror, they had fled and told Moses, "Speak thou with us, and we will hear," Ex. 20:19. They had repeated their promise of obedience, Ex. 24:3. Yet, when Moses remained on the mount forty days and forty nights, Ex. 24:18, the people forgot their vows, forgot the marvelous manifestation of God's holiness, apostatized from God and spoke disrespectfully of their divinely appointed leader, Ex. 32:1 ff. In true pedagogic wisdom, therefore, the Lord, after

again receiving them into covenant relationship, Ex. 34:10 ff., and knowing that Israel was a stiffnecked people, Ex. 33:3; cp. 34:9, decided to teach them the glory of the covenant and their duty to obey their God and the mediator of the covenant by causing the face of Moses to shine in divine glory whenever he spoke to the people after having received a divine revelation.

Since this was so important a truth and its repetition so necessary, the Lord did not only teach it in this symbolic manner, but had all His prophets, beginning with Moses, din it into the ears of His people, reminding them of their divine obligation to obey the Law of Moses and of the dire consequences of their failure to live up to their duty.

The glory radiating from Moses with such brilliance that the children of Israel could not fix their eyes on it nor bear its supermundane splendor, was a reflected glory, a glory not inherent in himself. It was, as the apostle expressly states, a glory that was being done away with, even while it was shining. This is expressed by the present participle, τὴν καταργουμένην, 2 Cor. 3:7. This glory was not intended to last forever; it was not even to continue unabated until Moses' death. From the moment that it had reached its greatest brilliance, it began to wane. It was a perishable and perishing glory, in need of constant restoration or at least replenishment.

Here was the second lesson of vital importance that God wanted to teach Israel. The Old Testament was not an end in itself; it was only the means to an end. In due time it was to give way to another covenant, far more glorious. It was to stress the majesty of the demanding and punitive holiness and justice of God and to show the utter impossibility of satisfying this holiness by any efforts on the part of man, the sinner. Sin was to become to them the horrible thing it really is, a separation from God, a rebellion against the Most High. The children of Israel, therefore, were not to pin their faith and their hope of salvation on the outward performance of the rites and ceremonies prescribed in the Mosaic Law, but on Him to whom all these rites pointed forward, the promised Woman's Seed, their Messiah and Redeemer. To Him, therefore, Moses at the end of his life once more directed their attention as to the Prophet like unto him, but far greater than he, unto whom they must hearken if they desired forgiveness of sin, true righteousness, and eternal salvation, which he and his Law could never procure for them. Deut. 18:15-19. The later prophets in very plain language likewise pointed out the insufficiency of the Old Covenant rituals (1 Kings 8:27; Ps. 50:7-14; Is. 1:11 ff.; 66:1, 2; Jer. 6:20; Amos 5:21-24), its evanescence (Jer. 3:16; 31:31-34; Ezek. 11:16), and constantly called attention

to the spiritual character of the kingdom their Messiah was to establish. These truths should have filled the hearts of the Israelites with gratitude, with longing for the New Covenant and its blessings (Ps. 14:7; 53:7), with a fervent desire and a firm resolve to serve their kind and gracious and wise God of salvation with unabating zeal and unwavering obedience.

The Searcher of hearts, however, knew that the heart also of the children of Israel was a deceitful thing and desperately wicked. He knew that this heart would only too readily be inclined to regard the insufficiency and the impermanence of the Mosaic covenant as an excuse to neglect and despise its demands and its promises. Its mediator, though brilliantly gifted, divinely called, and highly honored (Deut. 34:10-12), was, after all, a human being, the glory of his face a dying glory. Why submit to him, why honor him and his covenant? In order to hold in check the wicked and deceitful heart, God wisely decided, in particular, symbolically to veil the disappearance of Moses' glory, so that Israel would not fix its attention unduly on the fleeting character of Moses' glory, and, in general, to place in the background the impermanence of the covenant as compared with its privileges and obligations. And this pedagogy He followed throughout the era of nonage of His children; cp. Gal. 4:1-3. While reminding them, as we have already seen, of the transitoriness and inefficacy of the Old Covenant, while emphasizing clearly the spiritual character and greater glory of the New Covenant, still He described the new era in the terms of the ritual and ceremonies of the old. It is Zion, Jerusalem, the Temple, the priests and Levites, the sacrifices, in brief, the Levitical worship which furnishes both the terminology and the background for the description of the glory of the New Covenant. And God's purpose throughout was to prevent neglect and contempt of the Old Covenant while it lasted. The children of Israel were to fix their eyes not so much on the transitory character of their covenant as on the covenant demands and promises and in true faith to find hope and comfort in the latter and strength and willingness strictly to obey the former.

Did Israel learn the lessons God intended to teach them? We read, But their minds were blinded, v. 14 a, ἐπωρόθη, hardened, rendered callous. Their minds, νοήματα, the products of their mind, of their reason, of their thinking, became hardened, petrified, obdurate.

Paul does not say that God was the cause of their hardening, either by predestinating them unto such hardening or by telling Moses to place the veil before his face in order to prevent them from seeing the real meaning and purpose of the Old Testament or by hardening their hearts in punishment of their stubborn-

ness. Since the latter, the punitive hardening by God's justice, is irrevocable, and since v. 16 admits the possibility and actuality of conversion, the Apostle can have in mind here only the self-hardening of the Jews, their stubborn refusal to learn the lesson taught by the Lord in clear words and by various symbols. They took for granted what their own mind told them instead of listening wholeheartedly and attentively and believingly and obediently to God's Word as revealed in Scripture. Neglecting and despising the real glory of the Old Testament, its demand of perfect love toward God and their fellow men and its promise of a Savior in whom they would have righteousness and strength, they regarded the external fulfillment of its demands as sufficient and went so far as to rely on outer membership in Israel as a guarantee of eternal salvation, irrespective of their mode of life. And overlooking the transitory character of the Mosaic covenant and its fulfillment in Christ, they took for granted that it would last forever, that the Temple would be the center of worship until the end of time, that salvation not only was of the Jews, John 4:22, but that, in order to be a member of God's covenant people, one had to submit to all the rites and regulations of the Mosaic Law. Such was the spirit that persisted in spite of the warnings and exhortations of Moses and the prophets. Deut. 10:16; Is. 1:10-15; Jer. 7:8-34; cp. Matt. 23:3-28; Mark 7:1-23. That was the reason why Jesus, the Messiah, met with the bitterest opposition from His own countrymen.

This self-hardening against God and His Word, be it Law or Gospel, is all that natural man can accomplish. Natural mind is enmity against God; the things of the Spirit of God are foolishness unto him, neither can he know them. 1 Cor. 2:14. The very manner in which God speaks of the total depravity of man in such passages as Gen. 6:5; 8:21; Mark 7:21, 22; Rom. 3:9-18 is hateful to him, an offense. The Law, revealing man's heart as it is, works wrath, angry denial of this truth so odious to the carnal mind, puffed up with pride and self-satisfaction. And the Gospel of Christ crucified, the vicarious atonement of the suffering Savior, is, to Jew and Gentile alike, a stumblingblock, folly, and foolishness. Therefore all the products of this mind, its thoughts and plans and ideas and schemes, are hardened, cast into the inflexible mold of unbelief and hatred against God. They either will in open defiance against God serve sin and enter upon the downward course described in Rom. 1:18-32; or if they resist this temptation, they will be bound the faster in the chains of pride and self-satisfaction. If man is not a publican and sinner, he is a self-righteous Pharisee or a combination of both, in every case hardening his mind and all his thinking against both Law and Gospel. Man today is by nature no better than the Jew of Paul's day.

"For until this day remaineth the same veil untaken away in the reading of the Old Testament, which veil is done away in Christ," v. 14 b. This statement proves, γὰρ, the fact and the continuance of the self-hardening of Israel. Paul speaks here of the Old Testament in contrast to the New Testament. 2 Cor. 3:6. Moses' covenant was the old one, παλαιά, the term implying the idea of being worn out and ready to pass away (cp. Heb. 8:13); hence a very appropriate term in this connection. This is the only time it is used in the Bible.

"The same veil" which was referred to in v. 13 as preventing the Israelites from fixing their attention on the end of that which was being done away, still abides, remains, to this day, to the time at which the apostle wrote this letter. It abides during,¹⁾ or as the A. V. translates it, in the reading of the Old Testament. The term "reading," ἀνάγνωσις, in New Testament usage designates not private perusal of the Bible, but the public reading of parts of the Old Testament in the synagogues and early Christian meeting places. Acts 13:15; 1 Tim. 4:13; cp. Acts 15:21. Naturally the same veil remains also when these people privately read and study the Old Testament.

This veil remains unremoved, abides as one not unveiled, or lifted away.²⁾ On the expression "to unveil a covering" compare ἀνακαλύπτειν συγκάλυμμα, Deut. 22:30 (LXX); also Is. 47:2 (LXX). The Apostle simply states the fact that the veil still abides, without stating where it remains or what object it veils. He tells us that in verse 15. It lies upon their heart. But before he tells us that, he states another wonderful fact, which makes the veiling of

1) We translate "during" or "in the reading" and not "over the reading." The latter translation is preferred by Meyer, Bachmann, and others, who find here a correspondence expressed between the veil hanging over Moses' face while he spoke to the people and the veil hanging over the reading of the Old Testament by means of which Moses still spoke. But there are valid reasons against adopting this interpretation. (1) We have learned that the veil did not cover Moses' face when he proclaimed the divine revelations. Hence the correspondence does not exist and could not have been intended by the Apostle. (2) What an involved explanation, which really explains nothing, is that, e. g., of Meyer, that Paul conceives the public reading as "taking place under the veil enwrapping this act, so that in the reading the Jews remained shut out from insight into the New Covenant." Why did he not simply say, On the Old Testament when it was read to them? (3) In Paul's conception the veil hung neither on the Old Testament nor on the reading of it, but, according to v. 15, on the hearts of the Jews whenever the Law was being read.

2) Many commentators translate the μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον as an absolute nominative or accusative, "Since it is not revealed that the veil is annulled in Christ." Then the Apostle would be stating a falsehood. The removal of the veil in Christ was revealed already in the Old Testament, as we have seen, and certainly most clearly in the New Testament era, of which the Apostle speaks; cp. "to this day," and the present tense, "remaineth," μένει.

the hearts of the Jews the more remarkable. We read: "Which veil is done away in Christ." Two very important truths are taught here in connection with the veil: the one, that it was to be *abolished* at some time by someone; the other, that this annulment of the veil was to be accomplished *in Christ*.

Note that the Apostle does not merely say that the veil is lifted; he uses a much stronger word—it is being abolished, done away with, destroyed. The veil had served its purpose: it had aided in keeping the children of Israel under tutors and governors until the time appointed of the Father, in bondage under the elements of the world, Gal. 4:2, 3. Now the fullness of time, the time of the New Covenant, has come, and the veil is abolished. The Apostle uses the present tense because he had used the word "remaineth" in the present tense to describe a state continuing from centuries past to the present day. In a similar manner the present *καταργεῖται*, "is done away," describes a state which occurred in Christ, when by His death, resurrection, and ascension He finally and forever destroyed this veil, an act the effects of which continue from that time onward throughout time and eternity. The message of the New Covenant is, The veil is put away! Old things have passed away, etc., 2 Cor. 5:17b. And why? Answers the Apostle, "In Christ." And 2 Cor. 5:18-21 he expands on this brief statement. Compare also Gal. 3:4; Eph. 2:11-22. "In Christ" does not mean in the faith of Christ. It is not our faith, but Christ who destroys the veil. Our faith merely basks in the glory and sunshine of the New Testament, in which Christ has withdrawn and destroyed all the veils hiding the fullness of His glory. And, oh, what a complete destruction of the veils hiding by man's own fault the real purpose and meaning of the Old Testament has Christ effected! The veil that caused the Jews to regard the outward fulfillment of the Mosaic Law or the performance of sacrifices or the mere membership in the commonwealth of Israel as a guarantee of everlasting salvation, how completely and gloriously destroyed by Christ, who was made unto us the righteousness of God, with which God is well pleased and which alone can satisfy the conscience at all times against all accusations of the evil Foe! That Law with all its demands and ceremonies and restrictions, that Law which served as a partition wall between Jews and Gentiles, is battered down, abolished by Jesus Christ, who made in Himself of twain one new man, Eph. 2:14-21. That misreading of the Old Testament, that misinterpretation of its symbols, which made this unbearable burden, Acts 15:10, a permanent institution, is now abolished in Christ, in whom we have life and liberty from all the laws of Moses free and gratis.

Now we understand the reason why Paul could say, We use

great plainness of speech, and the distinction he makes between his own method of preaching and that of Moses, vv. 12, 13. This frankness and openness is in keeping with the very nature of the New Testament. While the Old Testament had only the example, the pattern, the shadow, of things to come (Col. 2:17; Heb. 8:5; 9:23; 10:1), the New Testament has the body, the very image of good things, the heavenly things themselves, the eternal actualities and realities which Christ has procured. The Old Testament was the time of prophecy, of promise; the New Testament, of fulfillment and realization; the Old Testament, one of hope and expectation and longing; the New Testament, of actual possession and full fruition and enjoyment. In agreement with this nature of the New Testament its ministry may and should make use of this blessed privilege. We should preach the full Gospel, the good tidings of great joy, without reservation, without if and but. "It is finished!" cried Christ, John 19:30. The veil is abolished! writes the Apostle. Let us not put the veil back on the Gospel by restrictions, by conditions to be fulfilled, by any human addition, whereby the Gospel of the free grace of God, of perfect righteousness in Christ, of sure salvation, is darkened, or covered, or deprived of the least ray of its divine glory. Let us, like the Apostle, use that plainness and openness and frankness in preaching the Gospel that is demanded by the very nature of the New Testament.

And yet, in spite of the glorious facts that the Apostle had stated v. 14 c, "even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart," v. 15. Ἀλλά marks the contrast between the two facts, seemingly contradictory opposites: The veil is annulled; the veil still remains. It remains "when Moses is read," ἡνίκα ἂν ἀναγινώσκῃται. This conjunction occurs in the New Testament only here and v. 16. "It denotes the indefinite idea, as the subjunctive shows. Note the ἂν and εἰάν (indefinite also and with notion of repetition)." Robertson, *A Grammar*, First Ed., p. 971. Bauer-Preuschen translates, when; with present subjunctive, as often; for the aorist subjunctive with ἂν he lists two papyrus passages where it evidently means, every time when, as often as.

Moses was read every Sabbath and twice each week in the synagogues and undoubtedly read at home and taught to the children. The Jews were well versed in the Law and were well acquainted with the promise of the Messiah (Matt. 2:4 ff.; 17:11, 12; John 1:46, 47; 4:25; 7:41, 42; etc.); they compassed sea and land to make one proselyte (Matt. 23:15); they were ready to die for their religion. Yet all the while a veil hung upon their hearts, a veil of their own weaving; the veil of unbelief and blindness to their own Scriptures. All the while they misread both the Law and the Gospel of the Old Testament. All the while they

refused to cast aside their own righteousness, their own mistaken notions, their own vain dreams of temporal power, and to fall down before Jesus to own Him their Lord and King, their God and Redeemer. This they refused to do although such turning to the Lord in repentance and faith would have abolished this veil and opened to them also the full glory of the Old Testament in the bright light of the New.

"Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away," v. 16. Practically all commentators agree that Paul here again refers to Ex. 34:34; adopting as much of the phraseology of the LXX as he can use to express another important truth. He does not, however, teach a general conversion of Israel, occurring perhaps in the millennium. In the first place, he speaks of repeated turnings, as the ἡνίκα ἑάν clearly indicates. No one teaches frequent conversions of Israel as a nation, and the Apostle would contradict himself; cp. Rom. 11:7; 1 Thess. 2:16. Secondly, the singular cannot refer to Israel as a nation. In the preceding context Paul had spoken of the nation as the children of Israel, vv. 7, 13, and had used the plural pronoun, vv. 14, 15. The change from the plural to the singular would be a very harsh one. Nor is it necessary to assume so sudden and harsh a change. The subject of "turn" is found in v. 15, "their heart." On the expression, "the heart turns to the Lord" cp. Luke 1:17; Mal. 4:16; Joel 12:13; 2 Chron. 36:13. That is the true circumcision (Rom. 2:29; Acts 7:51), already demanded in the Old Testament (Deut. 10:16; 30:6; Jer. 4:4), consisting in being given a new heart and spirit (Ezek. 11:19, 20). Whenever the heart of the unbelieving Jew is turned to the Lord, whenever he accepts Jesus as his personal Savior, the veil is taken away. Περιαιρέω means to remove that which surrounds an object from around it. The present tense teaches again a very important lesson. Such a removal is not necessarily at once a complete removal. It is rather a gradual process. How difficult was it even for the disciples of Jesus to rid themselves of this veil of preconceived ideas! Matt. 16:22; 20:20 ff.; Luke 9:45; 18:34; Acts 1:6; 10:14, 15, 28; 11:2 ff.; 15:1-5, 24; etc. To this day chiliastic Fundamentalists have not rid themselves of this veil. The better we learn to know Jesus and His glory, the more we study the Old Testament in the light of the New, the more completely will the veil which was annulled in Christ be removed from our hearts, the better we shall understand the Old Testament and its many prophecies by word or symbol of the coming Messiah and His kingdom; the more clearly we shall realize that already in the Old Testament no other way to eternal life was revealed than that of faith in the Woman's Seed (Gen. 3:15), the Man, the Lord (Gen. 4:1), the Lord, our Righteousness (Jer. 23:6); the more

joyously shall we be convinced that Jesus is our only Savior, our perfect Redeemer.

"Now, the Lord is that Spirit; and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty," v.17. Now, *δέ*, is explanatory. Paul explains why conversion to the Lord Jesus has the effect of taking the veil off the heart of the unbeliever. The Lord is, of course, the same Lord referred to in v.16, whom we identified with the Christ of v.14. This Lord, the Mediator of the New Covenant, in whom the veil hanging over the heart of man is said to be destroyed, v.14, is unlike the mediator of the Old Testament, not a mere man. He is "the Spirit." He is not merely spirit, or a spirit, having spiritual nature, as angels are spirits, though they are created beings; or as the new man, created after God's likeness, is frequently called "spirit." The Apostle in order to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding, writes *τὸ πνεῦμα*, the Spirit; the one eternal Spirit, like whom there is none other, the ever-living God. Together with the Father and the Holy Ghost He is the Spirit, the three persons being the one Spiritual Being. Since He is the Spirit, His words are therefore able to accomplish things for which no man is sufficient (cp. 2 Cor. 2:14-16), and therefore fully able to kill through the letter of the Law spoken by Him and to quicken by the spirit of life breathing in the Gospel spoken by Him (2 Cor. 3:6). Hence He is well able to cause the heart of unbelieving man to turn to Him in true faith and thereby to remove the veil that hung upon his heart.

Again, this statement is further explained in the next sentence connected with it by another *δέ*, but, however. "Where, however, the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." The Spirit of the Lord is the Holy Ghost, who is called the Spirit of the Son of God (Gal. 4:6), of Christ (Rom. 8:9; 1 Pet. 1:11). Where this Spirit is, there is liberty, for the Spirit of God and Christ imparts the liberty which Christ has procured for all men (John 8:32, 36; Gal. 5:1) to the individual by working saving faith in his heart. The Holy Spirit is mentioned here because the appropriation of Christ's salvation to man is chiefly His work. The exalted Christ sends His Spirit to build the Church purchased by the Lord's blood. This Spirit, who with the Father and the Son is the fountain of life (Ps. 36:9), is active in and through the Gospel preached by the Christian Church and its messengers. Here is, therefore, not the dead letter of the Law, which demands, which promises only on condition of perfect obedience, but cannot work that obedience, that willingness, that perfect love toward God and the fellow man demanded by it. Here is not the lifeless ink (cp. v.3), the weak word of a human being, unable to grant that salvation it promises. Here is the Spirit, the almighty Spirit of the Lord, of that Lord

who has actually accomplished our deliverance, our salvation; who has procured for us righteousness, life, and salvation. The living Spirit of this living Lord works life, spiritual life, in the hearts of men dead in trespasses and sins, generates faith, justifies, sanctifies, keeps us safe, finally leads us to the land of everlasting life and liberty. Where this Spirit dwells and rules, there is no more bondage to sin and devil and death and damnation, there no longer the enemies of our salvation can dominate our hearts and minds. There is freedom, the glorious liberty of the children of God through Jesus Christ. This joyful truth is brought to its climax in the next verse.

"But we all, with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord," v. 18. "We all," Paul includes himself with all his readers, with all whose heart has turned to the Lord Jesus. "With open face beholding as in a glass." The Greek word *κατοπτρίζω* in the active voice means to mirror, to reflect. The middle, according to Preuschen-Bauer, means to look at oneself in a mirror. For this usage he lists a number of passages. In our passage, the only time the word occurs in the New Testament, an object is added. Hence we translate, We behold for ourselves as in a mirror the glory. The connection demands this translation rather than that favored by other interpreters, We mirror the glory. Not by mirroring the glory are we changed. The mirroring forth of Christ's glory rather follows the change. We are changed into the same image by beholding for ourselves the glory of Christ, the middle designating the interested, intent, eager beholding. This interpretation is in full keeping with the history of Moses' shining face, to which again there is a manifest reference here. Whenever Moses spoke to the Lord, he took the veil off his face, spoke to the Lord with "open face," mouth to mouth, Ex. 34:34. But he did not behold the uncovered glory of God, Ex. 33:18-23; He saw God "apparently," Num. 12:8, in a form or appearance which God had assumed as the cloak of His glory. So we with our face uncovered, no veil lying on it, with clear understanding, behold the glory of the Lord, but behold it not in its fullness; we behold Him as in a glass, a mirror, in His holy Word, which clearer than any other means reflects and reveals to us His glory, which the eye of sinful man cannot see. Cp. 1 Cor. 13:12. In Scripture, what glories beyond comprehension are revealed to us: the Creator; the Lawgiver; the Holy, Holy, Holy; the unsearchable Jehovah, I AM THAT I AM; the Redeemer; the Author of our salvation; our mighty Friend, Father, Comforter! Who can enumerate the items composing His glory as revealed in Scripture? While on the face of Moses the glory gradually waned and disappeared, we (as was

Moses through faith) are, by beholding the glory of the Lord in His Word, "changed into the same image from glory to glory." In chap. 4:4,5 Paul speaks of the light of the glorious Gospel of Christ, literally, the radiancy of the Gospel of the glory of Christ; and by this Gospel God shines into our heart in order to create in our hearts, by nature dark and dreary, the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. Looking into the glorious Gospel, reading its life-giving message, we are changed. By the power of the Gospel we undergo a metamorphosis, a complete transformation, in character, in thought, and word, and deed. The glory of our Savior, His perfect sinlessness as revealed in Holy Writ, cleanses our heart from its pride and self-righteousness; teaches us to realize in ever greater measure our own imperfections, our sinful depravity, our helplessness, the futility and utter folly of self-satisfied virtuousness. When we see the God-man suffering and dying on the cross, as revealed in Is. 53 and the Gospels, our hearts by the power of the Spirit are filled with an ever-growing hatred of sin, our sin, our iniquity, which crucified the Lord of Glory, which killed the Prince of Life. When the pages of Scripture reveal to us that unspeakable love of God, who gave His only-begotten son for us, and that divine love of Jesus who died for us, the Holy Spirit by this Word creates in our cold and sluggish hearts a true and affectionate love toward our God of mercy, our Savior; the desire to become more like Him; the power to crucify our Old Adam and its sinful lusts, to put on daily the new man, to grow in grace, to become more like our heavenly Father, our glorious Savior. Rom. 13:14; Eph. 4:24; 2 Pet. 1:4.

So we are changed, gradually but surely, into God's image from glory to glory. There is no waning, no diminution, no disappearance of the glory; there is a constant progress. The glory of today is but the steppingstone to a greater glory, a closer approach to the perfect image presented in our Savior, until we arrive yonder, where all imperfections will be a thing of the past and body and soul will shine forth as perfect images of our glorified Savior. Let us hear Luther: "The risen Christ is that image which is placed before us in order that we may know that He has risen in token of the victory over our sin. This picture is held before us in the Gospel and is mirrored into our heart that we may hold it fast by faith, that is, when we believe that this Word is true and daily practice and exercise it. In this manner the glory proceeds from Him to us, and the result is that we become constantly more glorious and enter into that same image that is Himself. Therefore Paul says that we do not at once become strong and perfect but that we must increase day by day until we arrive at the fullness of His likeness." (St. L. XI: 694.)

"Even as by the Spirit of the Lord." "Even as," i. e., in full keeping with the nature of one who is fully qualified to accomplish so glorious a change. This thought is brought out also by the omission of the article before the two nouns Lord and Spirit, which omission stresses the qualitative force of these nouns. The Greek words are best translated, from Lord of Spirit or, in closer approximation to v. 17, from Lord, Spirit. Paul undoubtedly means to express the fact that Jesus indeed is Lord; a Lord such as a lord must be to qualify for this great honor, the Lord of lords and King of kings, with whom nothing is impossible, who rules supreme in His kingdom as only He can rule. And this Lord is the Lord of Spirit, or Lord who is Spirit in the fullest and noblest sense of that term. His innermost nature and being is Spirit, transcending and penetrating all human thoughts (Is. 57:15), enlivening, spiritualizing, glorifying, all those who accept Him as their Lord and King, their Spirit and Savior. To Him alone be power and glory forever and ever! Ps. 115:1; Rev. 5:12.

This is a very suitable text for the last Sunday of the Epiphany season. The glory of the Lord Jesus manifested in the Gospel and the glorious power of the latter is the chief theme of this passage. The preacher may choose the theme *The Glory of the New Testament Ministry*. 1. It clearly reveals to man the fullness of the Lord's glory. 2. It freely makes us partakers of this glory. — *The Glory of the Lord in His Congregation*. 1. Proclaimed without a veil. 2. Seen with believing hearts. 3. Reflected in Christlike lives. (Lenski, *Eisenach Epistle Selections*.) — *Christ the Center of Scripture*. To Him the Old Testament points prophetically. Him the New Testament reveals as the Author and Finisher of our glory. — *Salvation Only in Christ*. Moses in all his glory cannot save us. Christ is the Light shining to the perfect day. — *Salvation, Not of Men but of God*. Man can only harden himself. Only in God's light can man see light and live in it. — *The Folly of Unbelief*. It hardens our heart to God's revelation. It shuts us out from Jesus and His glory. — *Lord, Strengthen Our Faith!* Preserve us from hardening our minds. Reveal unto us the fullness of Thy glory. — *Let Us Bring into Captivity Every Thought to the Obedience of Christ*. Following our own mind, we shall never see the light (neither in the Old nor in the New Testament). Only faith in Christ transforms us from glory to glory. — *The Christian's Spiritual Growth*. By the grace of God he does not harden his mind. By the grace of God his eyes are opened to the glory of the Gospel. By the grace of God he is gradually transformed into God's image.

TH. LAETSCH

Luther: A Blessing to the English

VI. Lutheran Progress

(Continued)

In 1529 Latimer at Cambridge in his two famous Sermons on the Card urged the universal reading of the Bible. He was opposed by prior John Buckenham in a sermon on Christmas Dice.

On April 3 the Catholics were threatened with Luther and his followers.

On December 6 Henry told the Kaiser's Swiss ambassador, Eustace Chapuys: "So far Luther has told nothing but the truth; and had he limited himself to attacking the vices, abuses, and errors of the clergy, instead of attacking the Sacraments of the Church, everyone would have gone with him; he would himself have written in his favor and taken pen in hand in his defense. He pointedly praised Luther, though mixing heresy in his books, which was no good reason for rejecting the many truths he had brought to light."

That comes pretty near to an apology from the proud English king to the humble German monk.

Tyndale's translation of the five books of Moses was "Emprinted at Malborow in the lande of Hesse by me Hans Luft the yere of our Lorde M.CCCCC.XXX. the XVII dayes of Januarij." Westcott says: "The spirit and even the style of Luther is distinctly visible." Some called Tyndale "nothing more than an English echo of the great German heresiarch." "Those best acquainted with the theology of the English Reformation will be the first to admit that we shall look in vain in Cranmer, Latimer, or Ridley for any such clearness of apprehension and precision as here displayed by Tyndale."

Thomas Hitton, a minister of Kent, brought a New Testament from Antwerp—burned February 20.

On May 14 Bishop Nix of Norwich complained to Archbishop Warham: "I am accombred with such, as kepith and redith these arronious boks in English, and beleve and gif credence to the same, and teacheth others, that they shuld do so. My Lorde, I have done that lieth in me for the suppression of suche parsons; but it passith my power, or any spiritual man for to do it. For dyverse saith openly in my Diocesse, that the King's grace wolde, that they shulde have the saide arroneous boks, and so maynteyneth themself of the Kinge. . . . Marchants, and suche that hath ther abyding not ferre from the See (are affected). . . . A Curat, and well lerned in my Diocesse, exorted his Parisheners to beleve contrary to the Catholic faith. There is a Collage in Cambridge,

called Gunwel haule. I here of no clerk, that hath commen ought lately of that collage, but saverith of the frying panne, tho he spek never so holely."

Soon after, Archbishop Warham again wrote Cardinal Wolsey: "With respect to the most accursed works of Luther, I have received through the doctor mentioned [Sampson] certain pamphlets which I will most diligently read and note."

Wolsey spoke of the "hellish Lutheran heresy."

In May Bishop Stokesley of London burned New Testaments and many other books in Paul's churchyard.

On May 17 Cromwell wrote Wolsey: "Certain doctors of both the universities are here for the suppression of the Lutheran opinions. The King's highness hath caused the said doctors at divers times assemble, and hath communed with them. The fame is that Luther is departed this life. I would he had never been born."

On August 18 Cromwell writes Wolsey: "I think you happy that you are now at liberty to serve God, and banish all vain desires of the world, which bring men nothing but trouble and anxiety. Wherefore, in mine opinion, your Grace being as you are, I suppose ye would not be as ye were to win a hundred times as much as ye were possessed of."

Archbishop Edward Lee of York denounced the Greek New Testament. Standish, a favorite preacher of the king, on his knees begged Henry to destroy it, for it would destroy the Christian teaching.

Bishop Stokesley of London said it was "abusing the people to give them liberty to read the Scriptures," and the great and good Thomas More called it "a design to depreciate the authority of an ordained priesthood and of an organized Church." Quite true, the Bible and the papal Church do not get on very well together. Writing against Alesius to King James V of Scotland, Cochlaeus, the Romish theologian, says: "The New Testament translated into the language of the people is in truth the food of death, the fuel of sin, the veil of malice, the pretext of false liberty, the protection of disobedience, the corruption of discipline, the depravity of morals, the end of concord, the death of honesty, the well-spring of vices, the disease of virtues, the instigation of rebellion, the milk of pride, the nourishment of contempt, the death of peace, the destruction of charity, the enemy of unity, the murder of truth."

On May 24 Archbishop Warham, Tunstal, Gardiner, More, "with the king's highness being present," drew up a bill to be published by the preachers. It stated that in spite of the widespread feeling it was not the king's duty to have the Bible in

English spread among the people. The king, "by the advice and deliberation of his council and the agreement of great learned men, thinketh in his conscience that the divulging of this Scripture at this tyme in Englysshe tonge, to be committed to the people . . . shulde rather be to their further confusion and destruction then the edification of their soules."

Even in this assembly there were "three or four that would have had the Scriptures to go forth in English," as one most boldly writes the king: "The which thing also your grace hath promised by your last proclamation; the which promise I pray God that your gracious Highness may shortly perform, even today before tomorrow. Nor let the wickedness of these worldly men detain you from your godly purpose and promise."

In 1528 Robert Barnes fled to Germany under the name of Anthonius Amarius and entered the University of Wittenberg as Antonius Anglus. He wrote "Sentences collected from the Doctors which the papists today very impudently condemn." He defends his Lutheran teaching and denounces the "delicious living" and "sumptuous palaces" maintained by bishops "by false feigned holiness in deceiving and robbing the people." If laws against lay control of the clergy "be not of the devil, tell me what is of the devil?"

He wrote it "this summer in our house," says Bugenhagen, who wrote a two-page foreword. It was printed at Wittenberg by Joseph Clug in 1530. A Basel edition has an eight-page "Epistola" by Bugenhagen.

The next year Bugenhagen translated the work: "Fuernehmlich Artickel der Christlichen Kirchen." The Wittenberg edition was followed by another at Nuernberg.

On November 14 Stephen Vaughan took a presentation copy to the king: "A Supplication unto the most gracyous prynce Henry the VIII." A London edition came out in 1534.

Simon Fish put out *The summ of the Scriptures Tr. from the Dutch into English*—likely the *Summa Christlicher Lehren* of Urbanus Rhegius.

On November 27 Chapuys reports to the Kaiser: "The Lutheran merchants have been no otherwise punished than by being paraded through the streets, and being compelled to burn their books; so where one spoke of them before, 100 speak of them now."

William Barlow, one of the early "Lutherans" of Cambridge, fell from the true religion and in 1530 wrote "A dialoge describing the original ground of these Lutheran faccions and many of their abuses." One of the speakers heard Luther, Melanchthon, and Pomerane. The Lutherans have better scholars but not better Christians. Later Barlow recounted and returned, became "a man

of many motions and promotions," and a most successful father-in-law — of the bishops of Winchester, Hereford, Lincoln, Lichfield, and Archbishop of York.

Tyndale's *Practice of Prelates* defends Luther against the king.

Tyndale's brother, John and Thomas Patmore, merchants, and another young man spread the New Testament. Lord Chancellor More had them ride with their faces to the horse tail, having papers on their heads, and the New Testaments and other books to be fastened thick about them, pinned or tacked to their gowns or cloaks, and at the standard in Cheap themselves to throw them into a fire made for that purpose: and then to be heavily fined, Strype tells us.

On December 25 a foreigner wrote to Florence: "Nothing else is thought of in that island every day, except of arranging affairs in such a way that they do no longer be in want of the pope neither for filling vacancies in the church nor for any other purpose."

The Praier and Complaynte of the Plowman of February, 1531, has the bishops and priests denounce the Lutherans as "they that trouble all the world with their new learning."

The divinity students had to swear off the teachings of Wiclif, Hus, and Luther.

Thomas Patmore read the works of Luther, Melancthon, and Pomeranus, for which Bishop Stokesley jailed him.

On February 24 Henry wrote Bishop Tunstal: "Considering what the Church of Rome is, it is no schism to separate from her and adhere to the Word of God. To follow the Pope is to forsake Christ. It is to be trusted the papacy will shortly vanish away."

In May the New Testament was burned at Paul's Cross. Why? The king was told it was faulty. Henry ordered the best learned men to make a better one so that the people should not be ignorant of God's law.

"Saint" Bilney was arrested in 1529; three times he refused to recant, the fourth time he fell. For two years he was most miserable, and then "he would go up to Jerusalem" like Christ to His death. He preached justification by faith only in the fields, he gave away a New Testament.

Dr. Warner went with him to the stake with many tears, but Bilney with a cheerful countenance exhorted him to feed his flock, that at his Lord's coming He might find him so doing. Then the fire was set to, and his body consumed to ashes, Nov. 10, 1531. One witness was Matthew Parker, one of the "German Lutherans" of Cambridge, later archbishop of Canterbury.

Prior John Ashwell in 1527 wrote Bishop John Longland of Lincoln about George Joye, a bold advocate of "Lutronous opin-

ions." But he begs "that no creature maye know that I or any of mine do shew you of these thinges, for then I shal leusse the favor of many in my contree."

The letter fell into the hands of Joy, and he fled to Strassburg and on June 10 published Ashwell's "fower opinyons . . . wyth the answeere of the said George unto the same opynyons" — in the main a defense of justification by faith. In 1531 he got out *The Prophet Isaye*.

Monk Richard Bayfield was converted by Robert Barnes and then imported Testaments and Lutheran books, twice in 1530 and once in 1531, which he landed, for the more privacy, in different places: as once in Colchester, the next time at St. Katharine's, London, and the last in some port in Norfolk; where he brought them to London in a mail.

He brought five of Luther's works, five of Melanchthon's, four of Brenz', three of Bugenhagen's, and others. "Which being smelled out, he was seized on, and examined about these books: he justified them and said, he thought they were good and profitable, and did openly exclaim against the dissolute lives of the clergy; so he being judged an heretic, he was burned in Smithfield the eleventh of November" — 1531.

Luther's "Liberty of a Christian Man" was translated by John Tewksbury, a shopkeeper in London. On December 20, 1531, the gentle More burned "the stinking martyr."

Bishop Gilbert Burnet in his *History* says that until the year 1531 "there was no dispute about the presence of Christ in the Sacrament; for the writings of Zwingli came later into England; and hitherto they had only seen Luther's works, and those written by his followers."

Lord Chancellor More attacked Stephen Vaughan for heresy in 1529; yet the king next year sent the Lutheran heretic to Augsburg to borrow money from the great international banking house of the Fuggers and to get hold of William Tyndale.

On June 19, 1531, Stephen Vaughan wrote Cromwell from Antwerp: "I have spoken with Tyndall and shewed hym as you wrot me the Kyngs royall pleasure was, but I fynde hym alwayse syngyng one note. You wrot that the answer whiche he made to the Chancellour was unlucky done. And so seme all his works to eloquent men, bycause he useth so rude and symple stile, nothing sekyng any vaine praise and commendation. If the Kyngs royall pleasure had byn to have loked theruppon he shuld then have better judged it, then upon the sight of an other man. The Prophetts "Esay" and "Jonas" are put forthe in the Englishe tonge, and passethe any mannes poore to stopp them from coming forthe.

"I cannot come by the boke of Luther; there cam but one to all this Towne, and was gonne or I receyved answer.

"I have another put forthe by Melanchton in the laten tonge, whiche I obteyned while I wrot this, and wold have sent it yow, but the berer thought it so greate. It is intituled *Confessio Fidei exhibita invictiss. Imp. Carolo 5. Caesari Aug. in comitiis Augusti*. I wold gladly sende such things to his Highness, but I am infourmed he lookethe not upon them hym self, but commyttethe them to other. I am sory he so dothe, by cause I know his high judgement in lernyng to be such as myght safely, without daungier, approve mennes opynyons by reding thereof. And trustyng t' other men may haply be desceyved."

Cromwell replied the King thought him "veraye remysse and slow in mynstryng to His Majestie." Vaughan wrote the King: "As touching a yong man being in thies parties named Frithe, of whome I lately aduertised your Magiestye by my former lettres, and whom your royall Magiestie geueth me in commandment withe frendly perswasions, admonytions, and holesome cownsaylls, to aduertise to leue his wilful opinions and errorrs and to returne into his natyue contrey: I shall not fayle accordinge to th' utter most of my power to perswade hym accordinglye, so sone as my chaunce shalbe to mete with hym. Howbeit I am informed that he is very lately maryed in Hollande, and ther dwellethe, but in what place I cannot tell. This mariage maye by chaunce hynder my perswasions. I suppose hym to haue byn therunto drynen throughe pouuertie, which is to be pitied, and his qualities considerid.

"I haue agayne byn in hande to perswade Tyndall and to draw hym the rather to fauour my perswasions and not to thinke the same fayned, I shewed hym a clawse conteyned in Maister Crumwells lettre contynyng these words followinge, 'And notwithstanding other the premisses in this my lettre conteyned, if it were possible by good and holsom exhortacions to reconsile and conuerte the sayde Tyndall from the trayne and affection whiche he now is in, and to excerpte and take away the opynyons and fantasies sorely rooted in hym, I doubt not but the Kings royall Magestie is so inclined to mercie, pitie, and compassion, that he refuseth none who he seythe to submyt them self to the obedience and good order of the Worlde.' In these wordes I thought to be such swetnes and vertue as were able to perse the hardest harte of the worlde, and as I thought so it came to passe, ffor after sight thereof I perceyued the man to be excidinge altered and to take thesame very nere vnto his harte, in suche wise that water stode in his yees: and answered, 'What gracious wordes are these, I assure you,' sayed he, 'if it wolde stande withe the Kings most gracious pleasur to graunte only a bare text of the Scriptures to

be put forthe emongs hys people, like as is put forthe emongs the subjectes of the Emperour in thies parties, and of other Cristen Princes, be it of the translation of what person soeuer shall please His Magestie, I shall ymedyatly make faythfull promyse neuer to wryte more, ne abide ijo dayes in these parties after the same; but ymedyatly to repayre into his realme, and there most humbly submyt my selfe at the fete of his roiall Magestie, offerynge my bodeye to suffer what payne or torture, ye what dothe His Grace will, so this be obteyned; and till that tyme I will abide th' asperance of all chaunces what so euer come, and indure my lyfe in asmoche paynes as it is able to bere and suffer, and as concerning my reconsiliacon His Grace maye be assured that what soeuer I have sayed or written, in all my lyfe, ayenst th' onour of Goddes worde and so proued, the same shall I before His Magestie and all the worlde vtterly renownce and forsake; and with most humble and meke mynde imbrace the truthe, abohrringe all errorr, soner at the most gracious and benygne request of his royall Magestie, of whose wisdom, prudence, and lernynge, I . . . so greate prayse and commendation, then of any other creature lyuing, But if those things whiche I haue written be true and stande with Godds worde, why shulde his Magestie hauynge so excellent a guyfte of knowledge in the Scriptures, moue me to do any thinge agenst my conscience: with many other words whiche were to longe to writte. Fynally I haue some good hope in the man, and wolde not doubte to bringe to some good poynt, were it that some thing now and then myght proceed from your Magestie towards me, whereby the man myght take the better comfort of my perswasions.

"I advertised the same Tyndall that he shulde not put forthe the same booke, tyll your most gracious pleasure were known; wherunto he answered, myn aduertisement cam to late, for he feared lest one that had his copie wolde put it very shortly in prynte, whiche he wolde lett if he coude: if not there is no remedy. I shall staye it asmuche as I can: as yet it is not com forthe, ne will not in a while by that I perceyue.

"Luther hath lately put forthe a worke agenst th' Emperour in the German tongue, which I wold cause to be translated into Latin, and send it to your Magestie, if I knew yor gracious pleasure. In it were manythings to be seen."

Oak Park, Ill.

(To be continued)

WM. DALLMANN



Outlines on Old Testament Texts (Synodical Conference)

Sixth Sunday after Epiphany

Genesis 28:10-22

Glorious is the revelation of God in nature, Ps. 78:18, 19; dreadful in punishment (Deluge, Tower of Babel, Pharaoh's Army); blessed in protection (Daniel, Elijah, 2 Kings 19). God reveals Himself in various ways: personal appearances, to Abraham and Moses; spoken words, Gen. 22:11; Matt. 17:5; visions, Dan. 10:5; special dreams. Jacob's dream is an impressive revelation of God's grace not only to the Patriarch, but also to us who live in the time of fulfillment. It strengthened Jacob in his faith. May we also be more firmly grounded in faith as we consider

A Dream Come True

1. *The dream;*
2. *How it came true;*
3. *Its effect*

1

a. *Setting.* Vv. 10, 11. Having incurred the anger of his brother because of the blessing, Jacob had to flee. He should inherit this land, v. 4, but now must turn fugitive. Not even a roof for night's lodging. 1 John 3:2.

b. *Scene.* Vv. 12, 13 a. Unique. Heaven rent asunder. Earth and heaven joined. Angels ascending and descending. The Son of God at the top of the ladder. Cp. 31:11; 48:15 f.

c. *Message.* Vv. 13 b-15 a. Speaker: the everliving God, unchanging, sufficient to keep His promise. As Christ showed Himself to His disciples in the glory of His Transfiguration before their serious trials, so here to Jacob to strengthen him. — Temporal gifts: He shall possess the land; be progenitor of a vast people, cp. 22:17; God's protective presence and a safe return. — Spiritual blessings: Jacob the third Patriarch to receive this Messianic promise. "In thee and in thy Seed"; "In him, i. e., in his Seed" (Stoeckhardt). The word used for seed is in the masculine singular. Jacob a blessing in his capacity as human ancestor of the Messiah. "All families," refers to universal grace.

2

V. 15 b. The dream of Jacob was not a fleeting image, but a promise of things the Lord would surely accomplish. The dream came true.

Under Joshua the land was given to Jacob's descendants.

At the Exodus, Israel had 600,000 warriors. Over one million Jews perished at the destruction of Jerusalem; yet there were many left. The many Jews today. The Lord protected Jacob against Laban, cp. 31:7, 29, and returned him safely home, cp. 35:6.

The fullness of Jacob's dream was realized in Christ. Through His redemptive work, Christ took away the sin of the world so that heaven is now open to all. John 1:51; Heb. 9:12; Hymn 105:1. Christ the ladder uniting heaven and earth through His incarnation. This event the theme of angelic praise; 1 Pet. 1:12. Christ is Jacob's Seed, Gal. 3:16. "With His holy, precious blood, and with His innocent suffering and death," He redeemed all sinners; and in Him, the true Seed of Jacob, all families of the earth are blessed for time and for eternity and made heirs of heaven and His glory.

3

The marvelous dream of Jacob moved him to action, vv. 16, 17. He felt the nearness of God's presence. "He feared and said, How fearful is this place." The cognate expression emphasizes the awe which filled Jacob's heart. No earthly dwelling sheltered him, but he was now in God's house; the door of his parental home was closed to him; here was the gateway to heaven. Vv. 18, 19. Jacob used the means at hand to glorify God. He erected a monument, consecrated it, and named the place "God's House." Vv. 20-22. Looking to the future, he made a vow of faithfulness and service to God—an act of faith. Heb. 11:9. As Wise Men from the East trusted the star on their weary way to lead them to Christ, so Jacob throughout the various vicissitudes of his perilous journey in firm faith held that this dream would come true. The brightness of heaven lighted the darkness of his trials.

If the dream urged Jacob to such activity, how much more should "the dream come true" fill our hearts with stronger faith and greater zeal. During the Christmas season we heard of the appearance of Christ in the flesh, 1 Tim. 3:16; John 1:14. Heaven and earth are joined. Now we are looking forward to Lent, with its message of blessings won for all people. Dark days are ahead. May we draw nigh to Christ in true faith; serve Him faithfully in our present position with such means as He has given us; pray to Him confidently as did Jacob.

Let us not lose ourselves in mystical contemplation of the appearances of God, but, having seen the Lord, also build a memorial, not of stones, but of consecrated service which flows out of faith, even as faith moved Jacob to say, v. 17 b; Hymn 533:4.

VICTOR MENNICKE

Septuagesima

Jeremiah 31:31-34

Man's fall into sin created the occasion for God to enter into a covenant with the fallen sinners. A covenant is an agreement between two equals, binding the contracting parties to perform specific obligations. Here God deals not with His equal, but with sinful man. And He does not demand any work or payment on the part of man, but offers Him the greatest of gifts free and gratis! What was this covenant?

God's Covenant With Man

1. *Under the Old Testament*
2. *Under the New Testament*

1

a. The text speaks of a "new covenant," v. 31. Did God make two covenants with man or one? Let us examine the text. Through a covenant God aimed to adopt sinful man as His child and heir. His further design was to enable that child and heir to serve Him with the ready obedience of a child, with holy works. "The covenant I made with their fathers," v. 32, can only mean the Law given on Mount Sinai. That was a pact freely entered into by God and His chosen people Israel. God laid down a number of "commandments," which constitute the essence of holiness. To them Israel should conform in deed, word, and thought. He on His part promised life, life in its fullest meaning, to all who keep His commandments, Lev. 18:5; Prov. 4:4. Failure on God's part to keep His pledge to man is unthinkable. If Israel breaks the covenant, it will incur a penalty: temporal and eternal death, Gal. 3:10; Deut. 27:26.

b. Israel failed to keep the covenant, v. 32. Not only did all Israelites sin, but their history is a constant repetition of relapsing into their besetting sin, idolatry. That constituted a violation of the sacred pact with God. The time came when God abrogated the contract in force between Him and His people, since it was "not faultless," Heb. 8:7. The Lord Himself called it "weak and beggarly elements," Gal. 4:9, not for any fault in the perfect Law of God, but because it could not create the holy life demanded, Gal. 3:21, and brought the curse upon the covenant breakers, who from innate corruption could not meet its stern demands, Rom. 8:2,3. It decayed and waxed old and was ready to vanish away, Heb. 8:13.

c. Thus Israel did not achieve holiness under that covenant. Under it the relationship of child and heir was not feasible. It is likewise impossible today. To attempt it is the height of folly,

Gal. 3:10. "All our works are vain And merit only endless pain."
 "Not the labors of my hands Can fulfill Thy Law's demands."

Old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new. 2 Cor. 5:17.

2

a. How is "new covenant," v. 31, to be understood? What the text calls "new" was in reality old. The "new covenant" is identical with that made between God and the fallen sinners in Paradise, Gen. 3:15. Strictly speaking, there is only one covenant between God and man: the covenant of grace. This neither waxed old nor was it superseded by the pact of Sinai, Gal. 3:17, but remained in full force. The Sinaitic covenant was to show to Israel their own unworthiness and the need of the covenant made with Abraham, which was merely a renewal of the promise given to Adam. What became old was the Law covenant, which had been inserted and which was only temporary.

b. What is the covenant of grace, entered into with Adam and Eve and valid until the end of days? V. 34 b: Forgiveness of sin, based on the redemption through Christ. God's promise to the first sinners was that He would send a Redeemer, the Woman's Seed, who should bruise (crush) the head of the serpent and thus accomplish complete deliverance from the serpent's power and from the implications of man's disobedience and by His active obedience bring about a perfect righteousness. That was God's part in the new covenant. And man? He should appropriate the redemption through a God-implanted faith and rejoice in the free salvation. Rom. 1:17. This covenant has no human mediator. The Law covenant was based on the condition that man keep the Commandments, and Moses was the mediator. In the Gospel covenant there is no condition or demand. God acts directly with man and gives, donates, salvation procured by the Son of God. And, therefore, if the covenant of the Law was glorious, the covenant of grace is much more glorious, 2 Cor. 3.

c. Under this covenant man flourishes "as a tree planted by the rivers of water," Ps. 1. Cp. Gal. 4:31. Text, v. 33. Cp. Rom. 7:22. The joy of salvation is kindled in the heart. Not "weak and beggarly elements" any longer, because, v. 34, describing the richness of the New Testament knowledge of salvation; Ps. 110:3. Under the old covenant the priest's lips kept knowledge, and the Law was sought at his mouth (Mal. 2:7), but under the new: "And they shall be all taught of God," John 6:45. The indwelling Spirit of God enlightens New Testament Christians as with streams descending on the Church from above. As freedmen in the kingdom of God let us live unto Him who rescued us and exalted us to the heights of the glorious liberty of the children of God.

L. J. ROEHM

Sexagesima

1 Sam. 17:42-51

This is the favorite story of every Christian boy. Has that spoiled it a little? Have we slipped into thinking that it belongs only in the realm of children's stories? The adventure, the courage, the wonder of it are always there. But underneath is a great deal more; it is a story of God's great ways with His people. The story is told to help us, too, the better to realize that

The Lord Saves His People

1. *That God is interested in the saving of His people*
2. *That God has the means to save His people*

1

Our world has become so used to ruling God out of things that even Christians may fall into such habits of thought. They may not doubt God's power or His presence everywhere; but they may begin to doubt that He is concerned. This story proves God's concern in two ways.

A. The forces that threaten Christians threaten God.

1. When a Christian is in genuine danger, it is God's own cause that is threatened. The defiance of Goliath was a defiance against God, vv. 43, 45. It was an attack not merely on the bodies of the men of Israel; it struck at their oneness with God, their confidence in Him. The real problems of Christians are those which threaten their souls. True, the threat may come by means of assault on the body. But this is the greatest danger that man can face: that trouble and disaster loosen his grip on God. Cf. Ps. 77:88.

2. But God is interested in His people. "The battle is the Lord's," v. 47. Ps. 121. This means He is concerned in their earthly needs, Matt. 15:32, and their spiritual ones, Luke 22:32. John 17:11-15.

B. When Christians conquer their enemies, it is a glory to God.

1. God had a stake in the conflict of Israel and the Philistines. Defeat of Israel would be also a shame to God; conquest by Israel would prove His power far beyond the borders of the Philistines. The very war and the threats of Goliath were means of making the glory greater at the victory, v. 46.

2. So God conquers our own problems and fears to demonstrate His greatness and love to the world. 1 Pet. 1:6, 7; 4:13.

2

This story is great in showing God's ways of saving His people.

A. He does not always employ power of body or of mind.

1. David's method. "The Lord saveth not with sword and spear," v. 47. God has His own devices, sometimes humble and near at hand. But they are His.

2. The problem that Christians must overcome is not that they do not look to God to help, but that they expect Him to help with human forces. Rather 2 Cor. 12:7-10. Ps. 124.

B. But His help is given in response to genuine faith.

1. David's prowess and defense: "I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel," v. 45. "In the name of"—by faith in, full of a conviction of all that God means to His own. Hence a faith in Christ Jesus, the guarantee of our hold on God. Rom. 8:31 ff.

2. The brothers had sulked and feared and worried, v. 24. But David thought on God, His constancy, His promises and power, vv. 37, 47. Faith is not an accident. It is a gift of God, and it grows as we draw on God's own Word of assurance and tighten our hold on His love in Christ Jesus through our use of the Gospel.

David won a great victory. We say it was great because he was so little and Goliath so big. No; it was great because David was so humble before God and so much greater than Goliath.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

Quinquagesima

Jonah 3:1—4:11

In times of war the feeling of mercy is often viewed as a sign of weakness. Ruthless destruction, strafing of warriors and civilians alike, hatred are the order of the day. Some claim that in order to be efficient in war, we must first be filled with a merciless hatred that will spare nothing.

As we are about to enter the season of Lent, we find in our text a different theme, the opposite theme: Mercy.

The Answers to God's Own Question: Should Not I Spare?

1. No, says the history of a nation
2. No, says a forgetful man
3. Yes, I should, says a merciful God

1

A. The city and country with which our text deals was notorious for its wickedness. Nineveh and Assyria were symbols of oppression to the Israelites. Two books of the Bible, Jonah and Nahum, deal almost entirely with this scourge of God's people. Nahum calls this a "bloody city, full of lies and robbery" (Nah. 3:1). The Lord says, Jonah 1:2. The history of Judah and Israel is inter-

spersed with accounts of Assyrian wickedness. They exacted tribute, 2 Kings 15:19, took captives, 2 Kings 15:29, destroyed Samaria, 2 Kings 17:6, threatened Jerusalem and blasphemed, 2 Kings 18. Jonah justly is commanded to announce, 3:4. The whole history of this city would argue: Spare not!

B. Let us make a comparison with our own nation. Twice within a single generation the Lord has brought the scourge of war upon us. This is a call to repentance. Did the first great war of this century bring general repentance? On the contrary, there was a postwar season of general loosening of moral standards, increase in crime, a naturalistic philosophy of education bearing fruit. What will it be this time? Are not most people at this time ready and poised for the longed-for happy days of free indulgence, temporarily curbed to some extent by all kinds of restrictions? Also the recent history of our nation argues: No reason to spare. Therefore this season of Lent proclaims a real national repentance.

2

A. Jonah, a strange character to be called a prophet of God! Told to preach against wickedness, he chooses the easy path of flight from duty so that he may preserve a safe silence toward the sinners. Driven back to duty a second time, he spends a day in proclaiming the city's doom. Strange to say, he is disappointed at his success in bringing a city to repentance, 4:1; he grumbles because God spared the city, and he bids death to come, 4:2, 3. He would have rather seen the city suffer the full measure of God's wrath.

B. How shall we explain such objections to God's mercy? Jonah was more interested in being right than in saving a whole city. He seems to have completely forgotten that he still existed solely because of God's mercy, for he had been cast into the sea to perish, and only an outstanding miracle kept him from going to perdition. God also showed him his inconsistency: Jonah would spare an insignificant gourd because it offered him pleasure, but he would not have the Lord spare a city of more than 100,000 inhabitants. Thus the man who forgot that he had been spared would not spare others.

C. So self-righteousness often sits in judgment over others, enlarges upon their sins, finds it entirely just that sins of others should be severely dealt with, and objects to mercy. Ex.: The Pharisees and the woman taken in adultery, John 8:3-7; those who found the victims of murder and an accident justly dealt with, Luke 13:1-5. Whenever we think that God should not spare others, we are forgetting that He has spared us.

3

A. The Book of Jonah, though an announcement of impending punishment, is also a story of God's boundless mercy. Here an unworthy nation, a people not connected with the chosen race except by hostility, is visited by an Israelite prophet. God's mercy transcends the bounds of race, color, and nation. Here, too, is a prophet who had deserved to be rejected and visited with the wrath of God for not performing the duties of his exalted calling yet who was spared. Unwillingly, but truly, the Prophet praises the qualities of God: 4:2.

B. So today God still says: Yes, I should spare. He is still gracious, merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness. Is. 49:13; Eph. 2:4-6. In Christ Jesus His mercy is ever new. In this time of turmoil, when all values seem doomed to destruction, the grace of God is still immovable. As a nation and as individuals we have a foretaste of this grace in this, that in spite of our transgressions, He has not dealt with us as we have deserved.

C. God spared a *penitent people*, 3:5-10. Impenitence frustrates the grace of God. Here is an important lesson for us at this time of Lent: The suffering of Christ, which we consider especially in this season, is not merely to arouse pity, but penitence. Hymn 143, v. 3.

To every penitent sinner comes the heaven-born assurance:
Yes, I do spare.

H. O. A. KEINATH



Miscellanea

The Church in a War-Torn World

What we are about to present in this brief discussion may seem strange to many whose thinking has been along the lines of a rather complacent traditionalism, an attitude which may be developed within a generation or two and then claim for itself the support of centuries. There is always the greatest danger in concentrating so exclusively upon one particular part of the Church's teaching that any presentation which emphasizes also other aspects of the Church's relationship to the world will be under suspicion as being at least tinged with dangerous tendencies. To speak very plainly: There are people even in the midst of the Lutheran Church who hold that the Church, in *all* its teaching, must concern herself exclusively with spiritual matters, with the salvation of men's souls, so that all the affairs of this present life are to be ignored, that is to say, the otherworldliness of the Church's true message is to be the exclusive concern of every pastor and of every Christian congregation.

This view is one hundred per cent correct if we think of the Church only in her chief function of extending the kingdom of God, inasmuch as according to this purpose the Christians are dead to this world, and their life is hid with Christ in God. Col. 3:3. Their citizenship is in heaven. Phil. 3:20. Although in the world, they are not of the world, but consider themselves strangers and pilgrims in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation. Phil. 2:15; 1 Pet. 2:11.

But for all that, as Scripture plainly states, the Christians, according to the body, are still in the midst of the world, not hermetically sealed up, but charged with the duty of maintaining social contacts, also with unbelievers of every type. In general it must be held that there is purpose connected with the life of the believers in the midst of the world, namely, that of living in good works. As Eph. 4:10 has it: "We are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus *unto good works*, which God has prepared beforehand that (*hina*) we should walk in them." The same emphasis upon design in the life of Christians is found in Rom. 6:4; 2 Cor. 5:15; Gal. 2:20. And this design is made a part of the functions of the means of grace in the Great Commission, Matt. 28:20, as well as in the one chief proof text connected with the doctrine of Holy Scriptures, 2 Tim. 3:17. This life of good works is described from its negative side, for example, when Christ asks His heavenly Father to keep the believers from the evil, while they are still in the midst of the enemies of their salvation. John 17:15; Rom. 12:2; Eph. 5:7, 8. On the other hand, it is not only by means of the preaching of the Gospel that we are to make contacts with the unbelievers about us, but also through our conduct as Christians, namely, by carrying out the commands of the Lord in the domain of Christian ethics and thus trying to influence those who are still without to appreciate the power of the Spirit of God in the lives of men. See, for example, 1 Pet. 3:1 b; Phil.

2:14-16. We are to let our light shine before men, in truly good works, that they may see these manifestations of our mystical relationship with the Savior and be constrained to glorify the Father which is in heaven. Matt. 5:14, 16. Our very conduct as children of light is to reprove the unfruitful works of darkness. Eph. 5:8, 11.

But Scripture goes farther than that, since it sets specific duties before the Christians, which they are to carry out in their various contacts with the people among whom they are living, under whom they may be earning their livelihood. Some of these directions are familiar to us from the Table of Duties. Others are referred to or implied in numerous passages of Holy Writ. The command "By love serve one another," Gal. 5:13, is not confined to the relationships within the Christian congregation, for in chap. 6:10 the Apostle bids the believers to do good unto all men. The Bible clearly speaks of various professions and trades, many of which had the majority of their contacts with such as were not believers, and yet all such believers are urged to perform the duties of their calling with all faithfulness. The Bible gives specific rules to believing rulers and kings, particularly in the Book of Proverbs. And the Bible just as definitely specifies the duties of citizens under any form of government.

If we, therefore, speak of duties of citizens in the present circumstances, under the impact of the unparalleled cataclysm of the global war with which we are most definitely concerned, we are fully conscious of the distinction between Church and State, of the separate dominions of their functions. Our discussion will not propose, in any way, shape, or form, a mixture of Church and State. We are not, even in the most remote manner, suggesting any aspect of a social gospel, for we are fully aware of the fact that nothing can ever be substituted for the message of sin and grace with which the Church is entrusted, by which we operate on the hearts of men.

We are here dealing with the ethical teaching of Holy Scripture concerning the duties of citizens, Christian citizens, if you please, over against the Government, not only in times of peace, but also in times of war. Christian citizens, in times of peace, will individually perform such duties as paying taxes, serving as officials of the Government, not only when drafted into service, but when their abilities and capacities are clearly needed. They will observe the laws made for the entire citizenry, such, for example, as concern property, building, also such laws and ordinances as go beyond the limits set by the Word of God, as in cases where the restrictions of prohibition affect the temperate use of spirituous liquors or the prohibited degrees in holy marriage are extended to include cousins. The same principles apply to congregations in their outward organization as corporate bodies or persons under the laws of the Federal Government or of an individual State. In most cases, property actually used for purposes of worship is tax exempt, this being a courtesy on the part of the powers that be. However, in the case of other property owned by a congregation, taxes levied by the Government are to be paid without opposition, particularly special taxes for particular improvements. In all such instances a congregation acts as

an organization acknowledged by the Government as a corporate body. A Christian congregation will, in all such cases, be mindful of the Savior's word "*Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's,*" Matt. 22:21, that is: Do your duty as citizens of the country in which you live.

Now, it is a fact that in these relationships there are certain overlapping areas or fields of interest, and that is the field of civic righteousness. Every good government is vitally concerned about good morals. Most governments are also ready to concede to the Church, to individual congregations and their pastors, a definite sphere of influence in this field. Knowing the influence of religion in the lives of church members, the States of the Union and other governments have authorized ordained and licensed clergymen of the various Christian denominations and of other religions to perform marriage ceremonies. It is not that the sanction of the Church is needed for the validity of the ceremony, for, as Luther rightly remarks, marriage is "a secular, earthly matter." But the interest of the Church in homes established upon the teachings of any church body coincides with the interest which the State has in maintaining homes as units of the State. A pastor who officiates at a wedding ceremony can do so only on the basis of a license issued by the respective official of the Government. We do not, on that account, say that a pastor performing a wedding ceremony is mingling Church and State. Another instance: The State is often very anxious to have pastors serve as parole officers, since they hold positions of authority and trust in the community and very frequently can exercise control over some wayward person when the influence of others fail. It is not a mingling of Church and State if a pastor serves the State in this capacity. And he may very well serve also in other Government positions if his congregation is satisfied that this incidental service will not interfere with the duties of his office. In itself such service is not condemned in Scripture.

Such an area of overlapping interests is also that of chaplains in the armed forces of a country, which involves the payment of a salary by the Government. The State is not interested in, not concerned about, the particular kind of Gospel message that the chaplains of the various denominations dispense, even if individual officers draw their conclusions regarding the effectiveness of the message brought by the representatives of certain church bodies. What the State is interested in is this point that the presence of the chaplains and the influence exerted by the chaplains produces a better moral attitude in the armed forces of a country. That there are certain dangerous possibilities, especially as to unionistic by-products, under this arrangement, is incidental, not essential, to the project. And the Church welcomes particularly this phase of the arrangement that we are in a position to give spiritual care to the men from our congregations who are serving their country, particularly under the Selective Service Law. Syncretism and unionism, although undoubtedly a danger in the situation, is not a necessary by-product of conditions, not even in the Navy of the United States, as past history proves.

All these considerations should serve for the guidance of congregations and pastors under the impact of the present war with its many implications. That soldiers may very well be considered as being engaged in a God-pleasing station is clearly stated in Scripture, and our Lutheran Confessions have frankly included this point in setting forth the rights of the civil government, as also Luther did in many parts of his writings, as, for example, in his classic *Ob Kriegsleute in einem seligen Stande sein koennen*. (Cp. C. T. M., XII:207 f.; 321 ff.) The attitude of so-called "conscientious objectors," if it is based on so-called "pacifism," cannot be defended or condoned by the Church, but should be corrected according to the Bible, the persons concerned meanwhile being treated as weak Christians and consistently corrected from the Word of God, so that their erring consciences may be set aright.

Nor does this exhaust the possibilities of the situation. There are areas of overlapping interests in this present wartime emergency which will be brought home to us in an increasing measure as the full impact of the catastrophe strikes our country. Since the Government is interested in the housing of thousands of defense workers, it may call upon individual citizens as well as corporate bodies, organizations of every kind, to offer their buildings, such as parish houses, for this purpose. Such facilities may also be required and hence requisitioned for day nurseries, hospitals, child care centers, juvenile welfare centers, and similar projects. The Government's Office of Civilian Defense is working on plans that take into account many phases of the present wartime emergency as it affects non-combatants. For individual Christians to take a hostile attitude would be both futile and foolish; and for congregations to refuse co-operation as the situation may require would not be in harmony with the duties obviously implied in the obedience to the Government demanded by the Fourth Commandment. We have many reasons to be most thankful that our Government, in times of peace, has held its requirements at a minimum, not only in keeping with the letter, but also the spirit, of the Bill of Rights. The Church has duties in a war-torn world. It is trying to recognize the full implication of these duties in spreading the Gospel where it is so sorely needed. That is the spiritual side of our work, our real task, our supreme and only duty in the actual sphere of the communion of saints. But we cannot afford to forget that, as human beings, as citizens of the State, both individually and collectively, we owe our Government service.

P. E. KRETZMANN

A Novel Christmas Present

Faith Theological Seminary of Wilmington, Del., organized about six years ago by Fundamentalist Presbyterians, has only a small library. The Rev. John Sanderson, pastor of the Bible Presbyterian Church in St. Louis and a recent graduate of Faith, induced his congregation to forward to the seminary library a shipment of Lutheran books published by Concordia Publishing House as a Christmas present. He hopes that this novel Christmas gift will enable the faculty and the student body to become better acquainted with the doctrinal position of our Synod,

even as this young pastor is acquainting himself with the Lutheran doctrine by taking regular courses at our Seminary. The shipment included such standard works as the *Triglotta, Law and Gospel, Walther and the Church, Christian Dogmatics, Popular Commentary, Popular Symbolics, Concordia Cyclopedia, Doctrinal Outlines, God and the Cosmos, Pastoral Theology, Reason and Revelation*. Such a gift will awaken in the hearts of the donors greater interest in the real heart of a seminary, the library. Our own people have made special gifts to the kitchens of our colleges and seminaries—and may the custom continue! But could we not inaugurate a Donation Day for our libraries! The librarians of our theological libraries at St. Louis and Springfield will gladly make suggestions.

F. E. M.

In Touch with Our Historical Past

Recently in a circle of men deeply interested in the future welfare of our Church it was pointed out that for the preservation of our Lutheran heritage our present and future generations of pastors must keep in touch with our historical past. This can be done either by enabling our theological students to study the writings of our fathers in their vernacular or by making our rich treasures of Lutheran theological values accessible to them in an acceptable English translation.

The suggestion is indeed timely. Our Lutheran literature in the English language is still so limited that to a large extent our pastors must use the theological works of Reformed and rationalistic scholars. It does not require much effort to show just what that might mean to our Church in years to come, for it goes without saying that our teaching and preaching is nothing else than a reflection of what we read and absorb by study. We give to others what we ourselves receive. Shall we in future disseminate Reformed or rationalistic thought?

In view of the coming centennial of our Church, it is perhaps well for us to consider the point at stake. We have choice treasures of sound theological lore buried away in our many synodical reports, the numerous volumes of *Lehre und Wehre* and those of *The Theological Quarterly*. In fact, also the early volumes of the *Lutheraner* contain so many learned theological essays that they deserve to be studied by our ministers today.

Reflecting on this subject, the writer took time carefully to examine for articles suited to the needs of the present crisis, as also for other valuable material, Volume Thirty-eight of *Lehre und Wehre*, published in 1892, just fifty years ago. The faculty of our seminary at that time was numerically small. In fact, there were only three professors to take a prominent part in the literary work for our periodicals, Dr. F. Pieper, Dr. G. Stoeckhardt, and Dr. A. L. Graebner. (Fortunately in 1893 came Professors L. Fuerbringer and F. Bente and in 1896 Professor G. Mezger.) But what these men wrote has abiding value. Even the relatively few literary contributions made by outsiders show a high degree of excellence in form and content. It may be worth our while to scrutinize what our scholastic periodical of half a century ago offered its readers.

In 1892 our Church was engaged in controversy on such questions as election and salvation, synergism, the prerogative of Holy Scripture

as the only source and norm of faith, and the like. It is not surprising, therefore, that Volume Thirty-eight of *Lehre und Wehre* should largely be made up of articles discussing doctrine, most of them running through several numbers of the volume. All of them are scholarly and most of them so very timely that today they might be taken out of their musty volume and placed (in a fitting English form) into Volume Fourteen of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY as appropriate reading material for our present-day pastors.

We are sure that studious ministers would appreciate reading such essays as the following: Dr. Pieper's "Foreword" on the *sola Scriptura* and the *sola gratia*; Dr. Stoeckhardt's "Christ in Old Testament Prophecy"; Dr. A. L. Graebner's "The Oldest Lutheran Church in America"; Rev. F. P. Merbitz' "The Doctrine of Original Sin According to Article I of the Formula of Concord"; Rev. G. Seuel's "The Godly Sorrow According to 2 Cor. 7:10"; Dr. Pieper's "Is it Really Lutheran Doctrine that the Conversion and Salvation of Man Does not Depend Alone on Divine Grace, but, in a Certain Relation, also on Man's Conduct?" Dr. Pieper's "Synergism in the Doctrine of Inspiration"; Rev. A. G. Doehler's "Luther's Translation of Job 19:25-27"; Dr. Pieper's "The Unbelief of Those Who are Lost, Solely Their Fault"; Dr. Stoeckhardt's "What Does St. Paul Teach Concerning Inspiration in 2 Tim. 3:15-17?" Dr. Pieper's "The Latest Case in the German State Church"; Dr. Graebner's "The Beginning of the Papacy"; Dr. Pieper's review of "Professor Graebner's *History of the Lutheran Church in America*." As we see, practically all of these articles touch on vital points of theology and therefore deserve as careful study today as they did fifty years ago. They are sound and solid Lutheran theology.

Under the title "Vermischtes" *Lehre und Wehre* also offered "Miscellanea." These miscellaneous articles, of course, vary in value according to their content. Nevertheless, we are sure that our pastors would profit by reading of Spurgeon's fearless testimony on behalf of the divine inspiration of the Bible, or the fine tribute to Luther's Bible translation, or Dr. Pieper's discussion of the Erasmus type of synergism, or the status of the doctrine of Inspiration in Lutheran circles in Germany, or why the theory of evolution was rejected by a prominent French professor, or the unscriptural character of the German State Church, or Mohammedan propaganda in Africa, or why the Pope condemned the promotion of the Elector of Brandenburg as King of Prussia, or the abomination of India's fierce Juggernaut, or the Pope's golden rose given expensively to favorites of his, or the re-dedication of the Castle Church at Wittenberg and the Pope's chagrin at this celebration, or the extensive mission work carried on among Jews in Central Europe, and the like. These are only a few of the many items offered, but they are sufficient to show that also the brief miscellaneous articles make fascinating and profitable reading for pastors today.

The "Theological Observer" material is grouped under the heading "*Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches*." Some of this will hardly interest the present-day generation of pastors; much of the material, however, is historically and doctrinally valuable even today, especially for ecclesiastics.

tical orientation. We quote a few of the many topics: Already fifty years ago Modernism among the Presbyterians had become so strong that liberal Dr. Briggs at Union Theological Seminary found many influential defenders of his viewpoint. — On December 22, 1891, died Paul de Lagarde, "extreme critic" and professor of Oriental Languages in Goettingen. — Under the title "Poor Japan" report is made of a "Christian" Japanese who, denying Christ's deity, sought to establish in his country a new religion, a mixture of Christian and Buddhist ethical tenets, thus beginning the Japanese anti-Christian movement that became victorious only a few months ago. — Prof. W. R. Harper misses "a theological classic" on Inspiration and asks: "Who will write it?" — An Anglican, a graduate of Oxford, becomes a Mohammedan. Incredible? "Why should it be incredible [asks Dr. Pieper] when so many Oxford graduates have turned Romanists and, as such, followers of the great Antichrist?" — Missourians are accused of teaching particular election as a means of gaining personal assurance of salvation. — An interesting study: the parish school problem in Illinois and Wisconsin. — The Pope's *tolerari potest* of Archbishop Ireland's Faribault school plan: Rome provides the public schools with Catholic teachers (sisters) while the State pays. — Clear and Scriptural is the reply of the Milwaukee Pastoral Conference to the suggestion of the Wisconsin Sabbath Union that the Church should insist that the Chicago World's Fair be closed on Sunday. — Dr. W. Koelling's confession over against the rationalism of Dr. Zoeckler: "I re-affirm my deep conviction that the whole Bible is *verbaliter* inspired by God the Holy Ghost and that it is therefore inerrant." — The strange exegesis of 2 Thess. 2:10 by one Prof. Dr. F. Zimmer: "In order that one may be an elect, he must personally fulfill the condition that he loves the truth." — The colloquy between Buffalo and the New York Ministerium with fifteen theses regarding the doctrine of the ministry adopted and the establishment of pulpit and altar fellowship between the two synods. — The synods of Wisconsin, Minnesota and Michigan unite into one body, forming the General Ev. Lutheran Synod of Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, and Other States. — Dr. Hilprecht, professor of Old Testament Exegesis, resigns from Mount Airy because his demands upon the seminary students were too severe. Writes Dr. Pieper: "Old and New Testament exegesis will always remain a *crux* to professors of exegesis unless students come to the seminary adequately equipped with a working knowledge of Greek and Hebrew. Only the well-gifted and ambitious students can make up what they have missed in language study during their preparatory school period." Dr. Hilprecht, by the way, later achieve fame as a ranking Assyriologist at the University of Pennsylvania. — Professor Wellhausen, "a destructive critic," leaves Marburg University to become Professor of Oriental Languages at Goettingen. — At the convention of the United Synod of the South at Knoxville, Tenn., the Tennessee Synod endeavors to enforce Paragraph III of the *Regulations in Regard to Work*, reading: "Every minister, professor, or missionary in any institution or enterprise under the supervision or control of this United Synod, before entering upon the performance of the duties of his office, shall make affirmation that he will inculcate nothing that

is in conflict with the doctrinal basis of this United Synod as defined in its Constitution, but that all his religious teachings shall be in conformity with the same; and that he will not foster nor encourage *inter-communion*, or altar fellowship with non-Lutherans, or unionistic services, or any secret society of a doubtful or deistic character." It failed in the attempt; the paragraph was not adopted.—The synods of Ohio and Iowa make preparations to hold a colloquy with a view to church union.—Dr. Butler predicts a union of the "great and ever-growing" Lutheran Church in America on the doctrinal basis of the General Synod. In his opinion the Lutheran Church must strive, not for pure doctrine, but for a "higher plane of spiritual life," for "diets for dogmatizing in this age produce dyspepsia."—A moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly found himself in a predicament; he had printed his synodical sermon beforehand and as he preached it, the ministerial and lay delegates, with copies in their hands, followed the text closely to see if he really did preach what he was supposed to preach.—Dr. Harnack of Berlin advises students to subscribe to the Apostles' Creed, but to work toward its abrogation after they have become ministers.—Ernest Renan dies in Paris at the age of seventy, representatives of the State honoring him by their addresses at his funeral. "The evil he did during his life [writes an exchange] will live after him, and thousands will rise up to curse his name."—Professor Virchow, Rector of the University of Berlin, advocates the abolition of the study of the ancient classic languages as the foundation of a general higher education, suggesting in place of them the study of mathematics, philosophy, and natural science.—In Holland the *Midnight Mission* endeavoring to keep men away from the dives receives no support from the police. Still, the mission proves itself highly successful.—At the celebration of "Sedan Day," in commemoration of the victory of the Germans over the French in 1870, a high school professor in Hanover addresses his students as follows: Go and prove yourselves worthy of your fathers. No matter whatever God you may worship—Allah, Buddha, Brahma, Jehovah, the almighty, eternal, gracious God of the Christians, whose love and mercy rest also on those who pine in prison—be honest." Remarks Dr. Stoeckhardt: "The end of the religion of the German State Church is bound to be pure paganism."

To study these old numbers of *Lehre und Wehre* thoughtfully and systematically means to take a graduate course in sacred theology—systematic, exegetical, historical, and practical. We live in the present; we orient ourselves to the future; but from our rich and abiding theological past we gain the inspiration and stamina to become useful both for the present and the future. *Tolle, lege.*

J. T. M.

Theological Observer

The Fellowship Question in the Lutheran Church.—The *Lutheran Companion* of December 10 prints an article by Dr. L. W. Boe, president of St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn. His article has the caption "God's Moment." The fundamental idea of it is that now the time has come for Lutherans in the United States to become united. He opposes the attempt to form a federation at present; what he advocates is the establishment of church fellowship between the various Lutheran bodies. The exigencies of the situation created by the war, he thinks, loudly call for such uniting. "Today we find 97 per cent of the 4,750,603 baptized members of the Lutheran Church of America grouped in three large bodies of practically equal size, two of which, the United Lutheran Church and the American Lutheran Conference, have qualified official relationships based upon the clearer understanding brought about by the exigencies of the war and experiences thereafter." As the next step he visualizes mutual recognition and the application of the principle of pulpit and altar fellowship. According to the official records he thinks there exists enough "unity of faith" to warrant such a step. The only excuse for refusing to grant fellowship would be "an open and notorious negation in practice of the official confession." He adds, "Just where the line is between sins of weakness and an open and notorious negation of the faith on the part of a synod or general body is not always easy to establish." Then, in looking at conditions as they confront the observer, he states that "between the United Lutheran Church and the American Lutheran Conference there is factual fellowship, the individual member practicing, or maintaining his right to practice, fellowship with members of the other group with whom he comes in contact, except with individuals and in instances where he is convinced that the official confession is openly and notoriously called into question."

The question whether membership in a synod denies to the individual the privilege of practicing fellowship with individual members of a related synod before full altar and pulpit fellowship has been officially established, he answers negatively. He does not wish to have too much emphasis laid on synodical lines. "Synodical lines do not belong to the 'unchanging things.'" "There must be a reasonable flexibility about formalities so as not to compel a denial of realities." The word of Jesus "Beware of false prophets in sheep's clothing," he holds, has reference to members of the kingdom of darkness. At the same time Dr. Boe does not think that one has to practice fellowship with everyone who belongs to the same synodical group. There may come a situation when one cannot practice fellowship with a synodical brother because of the latter's unfaithfulness. "In reality, is not recognition by a synod an approval of fellowship with a veto left to be applied in individual instances?"

As to present-day tendencies Dr. Boe says, "The history of the Lutheran Church in America has pretty much been the history of the country. Out of the welter of racial origins there is gradually emerging

an American type. As new relationships and fellowships are being established, there is emerging out of the welter of racial origins, differing tendencies, and doctrinal controversies an American Lutheran type which more and more agrees with the spirit of the Lutheran Reformation. The common Lutheran character is breaking through. Our common spiritual heritage will not be denied. The very ugliness with which we sometimes criticize and attack one another proves that we ourselves recognize our spiritual relationship." As to the value of mutual recognition, he states, "Recognition today will, first, make it possible for individual Lutherans to move from one end of the Lutheran Church in this country to the other, freely. Secondly, it will place us in that brotherly relationship in which we can do for one another that which is not possible as members of hostile or opposing camps. Thirdly, it will center the weight of Lutheran public opinion effectively on those practices that today are causing trouble and keeping us apart."

There is another paragraph of Dr. Boe which we must quote in its entirety. "What is the actual situation as far as practice is concerned? Does the United Lutheran Church in practice openly and notoriously negative its officially declared faith? Do the members of the American Lutheran Conference openly and notoriously negative its declaration of faith? Are they Scripturally justified in refusing full recognition to the United Lutheran Church; and Missouri or the Synodical Conference to the American Lutheran Conference and the United Lutheran Church? One who really knows the actual situation and the present tendencies within these bodies and judges justly and with understanding will, in my assumption, have to answer, No, that such is not the case. That individual, and perhaps many, instances can be pointed to both in the United Lutheran Church and in the American Lutheran Conference, and even in the Synodical Conference, which may seem to justify a statement to the contrary, can readily be conceded, but an honest estimate of the whole situation justifies making the declaration that the three groups can recognize one another on the basis of the present record."

Finally Dr. Boe, in discussing the implications of fellowship says, "There are matters of practice that must be faced and settled if union or merging is to take place, which it is perfectly legitimate to leave unsettled as long as each body retains its own household. If the Lutheran Church of America has the courage and initiative now to crystallize into form the fellowship which actually is being practiced with good conscience in accord with Scripture between individual members of the United Lutheran Church and the American Lutheran Conference and in lesser degree between them and the Synodical Conference, we can look forward to a tremendous development the next few years. We should not be sidetracked by dreams, or discussions of union, mergers, or federation, or by any of the practical questions of co-operation and co-ordination. The decks should be cleared so that Lutherans may move freely from one end of the Lutheran Church to the other." Dr. Boe thinks that this clearing of the decks will be accomplished if recognition and fellowship come about between the various synodical bodies.

Before evaluating what Dr. Boe has written, we should like to submit the comments which Dr. Ryden, the editor of the *Lutheran Companion*, makes on Dr. Boe's article. He states that he is not in agreement with the view of Dr. Boe that a federation of all Lutheran bodies should not be attempted now. But he goes on to say that he is in full agreement with the general thesis of Dr. Boe and with the premise on which it rests, to wit, that there exists a sufficient "unity of faith" among the Lutherans of America to bring about the recognition and the fellowship relations spoken of. The official doctrinal declarations, found, for instance, in the constitutions of the various church bodies, will show when examined that all these bodies stand on common ground. "Where deviations exist, they do not represent the official position of any Lutheran body; rather, they represent the intransigency of the type of free lances which are found in all communions."

In this connection Dr. Ryden, who until the recent American Lutheran Conference Convention was the president of this body, discusses the resolution passed by this convention in which its constituent bodies are urged "to invite other Lutheran bodies into pulpit and altar fellowship with themselves." The methods, how that should be done, were not prescribed. Why not? Dr. Ryden says, "(The Conference) was fully aware of the fact that these bodies are not willing to enter into interminable doctrinal discussions with other Lutheran groups to bring this about." He holds that these bodies will insist that the basis for fellowship must be the official declarations of each Lutheran group.

Concerning the relations between the American Lutheran Conference and the United Lutheran Church, Dr. Ryden agrees with the view expressed in the *Lutheran Witness* (November 10, 1942), that actual fellowship has long existed between these bodies since they have jointly carried on what must be regarded as distinctly church work. Dr. Ryden adds, "Therefore it seems rather inconsistent, not to say hypocritical, to work in closest harmony with other Lutheran groups and still refuse to acknowledge the existence of full spiritual fellowship with them."

Peace and harmony, Dr. Ryden says in the course of his editorial, can be brought about only "when we acknowledge each other as Lutherans, cease our endless bickerings and misunderstandings, call a halt to our destructive competition and duplications, seek mutual forgiveness for our petty jealousies and unchristian recriminations, and learn to worship and pray together as brethren in the faith."

No one will deny that the views expressed by Dr. Boe and Dr. Ryden touch important issues and that everyone who loves our Lutheran Zion here in America must frankly face the questions raised by the remarks of these two representative Lutherans. To avoid all unnecessary verbiage, we shall put our reaction into a few brief propositions. 1. The establishment of fellowship between the various Lutheran bodies here in the United States is highly desirable and should be prayed for and worked for by all of us. 2. Establishment of fellowship will be an evil instead of a blessing if it will hinder the full proclamation of the Gospel and a consistent Christian practice. 3. The establishment of fellowship will likewise be an evil if it takes place on an insufficient foundation

leading to misunderstandings and confusion which would probably be worse than the present divided state of Lutheranism. 4. That a body confesses the truth on paper is not sufficient if it is well known that a large part of it both in doctrine and practice deliberately disregards the doctrinal platform officially confessed by the body. 5. It is well known that with respect to an important matter the U. L. C. A. is a house divided against itself, namely, with respect to the verbal inspiration and the inerrancy of the Scriptures. We do not see with what justification a person could say that deviation from the old Lutheran teaching on this point occurs only in a few instances where some free lances go their own way unwilling to listen to their brethren. 6. On the question of lodge membership and pulpit and altar fellowship with members of Reformed Churches, it seems there is such a big difference of opinion between the various branches of the Lutheran Church that a good deal of ground work will have to be done before it can be stated that in this respect there is sufficient unity for the establishment of fellowship relations. 7. The interesting point made by Dr. Boe that the practice of fellowship should not be made dependent entirely on one's synodical connection has some truth in it. We of the Missouri Synod hold that it is possible to fellowship with a person belonging to an erring Church if he opposes the errors of his church body and testifies to the truth; such a person is then in what has been called the *status confessionis*. This view rests on the principle that, after all, synodical and other ecclesiastical lines are a matter of human origin and that there is something higher than outward membership in an orthodox church body, and that is, to be a consistent, loyal disciple of Jesus Christ. 8. The same truth applies in a negative way to a member of one's church body who has proved altogether disloyal to the Savior and whom one can no longer fellowship without denying the truth. In such a case disciplinary measures, of course, should be initiated, if possible. The justice of the remarks of Dr. Boe in that respect must likewise be acknowledged. Sorrowfully we append in the proof sheets the note that Dr. Boe shortly before Christmas departed this life.

A.

Meeting of the American Lutheran Conference.—The sixth biennial convention of the American Lutheran Conference met in Rock Island, Ill., November 11—13, 1942. Quite naturally, the subject of Lutheran relationships was given much consideration. In the *Lutheran Companion* the editor, Dr. E. E. Ryden, states that the "conclusions of the convention on this topic might be summed up as follows: 1. The American Lutheran Conference must keep its door open to other Lutheran bodies; 2. the Columbus Conference of 1942 set a direction and goal for American Lutheranism when it suggested the enlargement of the American Lutheran Conference; 3. co-operative endeavors, both within the American Lutheran Conference and the National Lutheran Council, should be encouraged and extended; 4. the executive committee of the Conference was instructed to 'negotiate with other Lutheran bodies, looking toward the eventual goal of an organization whose constituency shall be truly representative of the Lutheran Church in America'; 5. the constituent

members of the American Lutheran Conference were urged to 'invite into altar and pulpit fellowship those Lutheran bodies with which they are not now in fellowship.' Dr. Ryden further reports that the American Lutheran Conference "took cognizance of the expanding program of the National Lutheran Council and willingly surrendered some phases of its work to the Council. Thus the Commission on Home Missions was abolished in order that its work might be absorbed by the new department of the Council known as the Commission on American Missions. Likewise the Commission on Inner Missions was discontinued in view of the establishment of the department of Lutheran Welfare by the Council. Other commissions and committees discontinued by the Conference by recommendation of the Committee on Reorganization are: Commission on Foreign Missions, Commission on Hospitals, Committee on Adjudication, Committee on Stewardship. In abolishing these groups the Conference voted to strengthen the work of other commissions and committees whose activities have tended to promote the spirit of unity and co-operation which exists within the Conference. The Conference refused to receive into direct membership congregations which are not affiliated with any one of the constituent bodies of the Conference. It approved, however, the arrangement by which pastors may serve at the same time congregations belonging to two or more constituent synods. The question of whether a congregation may belong to more than one synod was left to the judgment of the synods involved."

The president for the next biennium will be Dr. H. L. Yochum of Detroit, Mich., a member of the American Lutheran Church.

In what we have stated above we have not incorporated several paragraphs of Dr. Ryden's report in which he mentions statements made by Dr. Conrad Bergendoff, president of Augustana College, and Dr. Em. Poppen, president of the American Lutheran Church, and Dr. Ralph H. Long, executive secretary of the National Lutheran Council. Dr. Bergendoff insisted that unity and identity must not be confused. "The Lutheran Church is big enough to have differences within itself." Dr. Poppen complains that Lutherans have been hiding their light under a bushel and that as a result we are misunderstood by other groups. He stated that Luther differentiated between faith and theology, asserting that "Luther never refused to worship or take Communion with associates with whom he had theological differences." Dr. Long "urged fraternal recognition and greater co-operation among the various Lutheran bodies." He likewise spoke of "the necessity of closer relations with other Protestant groups."

The report, of course, is fragmentary, and on that account one hesitates to pose as critic of the proceedings. To us it seems that the deliberations concerned themselves with generalities, the desirability of fellowship between the various Lutheran bodies and with other Protestant denominations, and that the matters which really call for study, because they divide the Lutheran Church in America into various camps, were too much kept in the background. We hope that more complete reports will show that our impressions of the nature of the convention were unnecessarily gloomy.

A.

Anent Lutheran Union.—In its issue of October 29, 1942, *The Lutheran Companion* publishes a lengthy editorial in which it discusses the topic "Lutherans Move Closer Together." The editor, Dr. Ryden, reports the steps taken by the American Lutheran Church in its recent convention in Mendota, Illinois, declaring itself ready for fellowship with the United Lutheran Church of America and with the Missouri Synod, provided the doctrinal statements that had been drawn up were fully accepted and adhered to. An error has slipped in through the confusion of the *Brief Statement* of the Missouri Synod with the *Declaration* of the A. L. C. What the A. L. C. expects the Missouri Synod to accept and adhere to is the *Declaration* made by the A. L. C., and not the *Brief Statement* issued by the Missouri Synod itself. Concerning the action of the A. L. C. Dr. Ryden says, "It is clear from the action taken by the Mendota Convention of the American Lutheran Church that its real purpose is to encourage the groups who are striving for Lutheran unity both in the United Lutheran Church and the Missouri Synod, in order that they might redouble their efforts to create conditions favorable 'for unity within their respective groups. No distinction was drawn between the two bodies; on the contrary, the American Lutheran Church made it plain that it is ready to establish fellowship relations with either or both of them, when it is satisfied that they have fulfilled the necessary conditions.'" Dr. Ryden is aware that "there is a large and influential group in the United Lutheran Church which is still in disagreement with the Pittsburgh document."

The editorial further dwells on the proposal made by the A. L. C. to call into being an American Lutheran Convention, which should be a sort of free conference for the Lutherans of this hemisphere. Discussing this feature, Dr. Ryden states, "The plan for an all-American Lutheran Convention is an outgrowth of the action taken by the National Lutheran Council at Pittsburgh last January and of the second Columbus meeting the following May. In a memorial to the National Lutheran Council presented by the Lutheran editors in January urging definite steps toward Lutheran unity it was proposed that a study be made of the 'feasibility of setting up an all-Lutheran federation which could make use of the National Lutheran Council as its working agency.' And the editors' letter added, 'Such a federation might well bear the name of the American Lutheran Convention and as such it could constitute the American section of the Lutheran World Convention.'" Dr. Em. Poppen, president of the American Lutheran Church, subsequently developed the idea of the American Lutheran Convention to embrace a Western Hemisphere organization, its membership to include Lutherans of the United States and Canada as well as Mexico, Central America, the West Indies, and South America. Dr. Poppen's proposal was studied at the second Columbus conference in May, but no action was taken. Instead it was the consensus of opinion of the representatives present that the scope of the American Lutheran Conference should be enlarged. Dr. Poppen has now revived his plan, and the convention of his body at Mendota requested him to submit the proposal to other Lutheran bodies and, if the plan is found acceptable, to request the

National Lutheran Council to proceed with arrangements for creating such an organization. According to Dr. Poppen's plans, the convention would not function as a legislative body, but as a free conference, meeting at intervals of three or four years. The aims of the proposed convention would be 'to provide and strengthen joint testimony for the pure doctrine of Jesus Christ and for the true faith as confessed by the Evangelical Lutheran Church, to foster Lutheran unity and solidarity in the Americas; to promote co-operative efforts in foreign missions, in missionary work among various racial groups, in Christian higher education, in charity or welfare work, in the publication and dissemination of Christian literature; and to aid Lutherans in distress, wherever they may be, particularly in the Americas.'

Dr. Ryden adverts to one more point, saying, "The American Lutheran Church also took a step in the direction of Lutheran unity when it gave approval to the proposal to set up a new department in the National Lutheran Council to be known as the Commission on American Missions. . . . The function of this commission will be to carry on emergency home mission work among unchurched Lutherans who are now employed in the great war industry areas."

That we are in favor of the holding of free conferences we stated in our Foreword in the January issue. Dr. Poppen's plan ought to be altered so that nothing is proposed but the holding of free meetings of Lutherans in which the issues which now divide the Church can be discussed.

A.

Re Pensions.—The amount paid in pension benefits by the major Protestant denominations during the past year totaled \$11,292,932, it was reported at the annual meeting of the Church Pensions Conference several weeks ago.

Every communion in the Conference except the United Lutheran Church puts its pension plan on a "contributory" basis. Congregations contribute annually to the pension fund in proportion to the salaries of their pastors. In most cases pastors also contribute a percentage of their salaries.

In the Episcopal Church the minimum pension is \$1,000. Each congregation contributes annually a sum equal to 7.75 per cent of the rector's salary. Clergymen make no contribution to this fund. American Lutheran and Missouri Synod congregations pay 4 per cent of the pastor's salary, and the pastor pays an equal amount. In the Norwegian Lutheran Church congregation and pastor each pay 5 per cent.

Large pension funds have been accumulated by various churches. Presbyterians, U.S.A., have \$43,675,448. The Episcopal Church has \$35,650,459. The Missouri Synod has \$4,191,126; United Lutheran, \$3,422,748. — *The Lutheran*.

Resolution of the U. L. C. A. Pertaining to Students Preparing for the Ministry.—At its meeting in Louisville last October the U. L. C. A. passed the following resolution:

"1. WHEREAS, Congress has recognized that divine worship and religious guidance and education are vital to the welfare of the Nation, both in our home communities and in the armed forces, and

"2. WHEREAS, There is a shortage of persons properly trained and qualified as regular or duly ordained ministers of religion, and

"3. WHEREAS, There has been a gradual decline in the number of students registered in our theological seminaries, and

"4. WHEREAS, It is recognized that in order to maintain an adequate supply of students in theological schools it is necessary to assure a sufficient number of students with the prerequisite training and preparation in recognized colleges and universities, and

"5. WHEREAS, It is evident that Congress is about to lower the draft age to include the youth of 18 and 19 years of age,

"Be It Resolved, That the United Lutheran Church in America in convention assembled petition the Selective Service System to permit the local draft boards to defer young men of the age of 18 and above who have declared themselves as desirous of entering the ministry of the Church, provided such youth produce certificates from recognized Church authorities to the effect that they are pursuing their academic studies in recognized colleges or universities under the direction and supervision of such recognized churches, and also certificates from recognized theological schools to the effect that upon the successful completion of their prerequisite academic studies they will be accepted and enrolled in said theological schools."

The *Lutheran* adds, "It will be noticed that the resolution is addressed to the Selective Service System and that this authority acts through the local draft boards. Pastors, congregations, and young men to whom the petition applies should take note of the method of procedure."

It is well known that the students in the college classes of our own synodical schools who have the ministry in view have been granted the deferment which is spoken of in the above resolution. A.

Lack of Navy Chaplains.—It seems that an item in the *Christian Century* pertaining to this subject should be brought to the attention of our clergy. "Speaking in Buffalo, Lieutenant W. O. Robertson, U. S. N., said that the Navy has been "very much concerned and disturbed by the failure of the clergy as a whole' to respond to the appeal for 400 Navy chaplains. He said, 'If we don't get chaplains, either the morale of the Navy will crack, or chaplains will have to be drafted.' Addressing Buffalo ministers, the officer noted that only 14 applications for chaplaincy have been made in that area in more than four months, adding, 'some denominations have not responded at all. The most important man aboard ship or at a naval training base is a chaplain. He is the only man to whom both enlisted men and officers can talk on the same plane.'"

A.

The Biennial Meeting of the Federal Council.—The meeting of the Federal Council of Churches and seven interchurch groups at Cleveland in the week ending December 12 is of more than passing interest. Two items of major importance were before the convention: The position of the Church in the present war and the merging of eight interdenominational agencies into the largest and most influential church agency in the

Western Hemisphere. The Federal Council presumes to be the official voice of American Protestantism on all social, economic, moral, and spiritual problems. Naturally, this convention would devote considerable time to a discussion of the issues in the present conflict. However, it is a well-known fact that the leaders of the Federal Council are committed to the social gospel. The statement on the war adopted at Cleveland clearly reveals this. This statement was presented by Dr. J. F. Dulles, noted Presbyterian layman and chairman of the Committee for the Study of Bases of a Just and Durable Peace. A synopsis of the statement as printed in full in the *Living Church* of December 20 follows: If the present war were a conflict only between national self-interests, then the Church as a supranational ecumenical fellowship would have nothing to say. The issues in the present conflict, however, are moral. There is a sharp clash between two different conceptions of the meaning and purpose of human existence. The Axis powers aim 1) to subject personal freedom to the tyranny of the State; 2) to abolish the democratic processes of law and justice by substituting a dictatorial and arbitrary regime; 3) to establish the domination of a so-called master race; 4) to make free nations vassals of a supreme military power; 5) to train the present youth in the totalitarian philosophy of life. This is, according to the Federal Council, not only unchristian, but definitely antichristian. The principles of the Axis powers are diametrically opposed to such Christian objectives as freedom of thought and of economic opportunity; equal opportunity for all races; a system of justice based on law; a world order expressing the unity of mankind as one family of God; education of the youth to an understanding of and personal commitment to Christian objectives. The statement as finally adopted points out, that, of course, an Axis victory would not necessarily mean that God could not accomplish His ends, nor that a United Nations victory would automatically guarantee the achievement of the stated goals. But Naziism and Shintoism are hostile to the Christian ecumenical ideal. Therefore the aim of Christians in this conflict is a just and durable peace based on the principles enunciated in the Delaware (Ohio) Conference of March 3—5, 1942.¹⁾ We believe that the findings of the Delaware Conference and the statement adopted at Cleveland clearly set forth some of the issues at stake in the present conflict. These documents present an ideal world order which, if adopted, would eliminate or at least ameliorate many of our present social and economic inequalities. As a contribution to a political and economic philosophy the findings of the Delaware Conference and the statement adopted at Cleveland deserve attention. But the basic error of the proposals is the utter confusion of Democracy and Christianity. Democracy is a social and political philosophy, which suggests to most people, and especially to our people, the best system of ordering men's behavior in their social relations. But democracy concerns itself exclusively with man's attitudes toward his fellow man, while Christianity concerns itself

1) *The Churches and a Just and Durable Peace*, a handbook of 80 pages, may be ordered from Christian Century Press, 407 S. Dearborn, Chicago, for 15 cents. This booklet sets forth all the findings of the Delaware Conference.

primarily with man's relation toward his God. The thinking of the Federal Council leaders as well as that of the Anglican Church in England under the leadership of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Wm. Temple, is along the lines of the social gospel.

The second important matter before the Cleveland convention was the proposed merger of the following agencies: The Council of Church Boards of Education, the Federal Council of Churches, the Foreign Missions Conference of N.A., the Home Missions Council of N.A., the International Council of Religious Education, the Missionary Education Movement of the U.S. and Canada, the United Council of Church Women, and the United Stewardship Council. The merger is to be known as the North American Council of Churches of Christ. Dean Weigle, retiring president of the Federal Council, was chairman of the committee which had studied the implications of the merger and wholeheartedly recommended "the creation of an inclusive co-operative agency to continue and extend these agencies of the churches and to combine all their interests and functions, to be known as North American Council of the Churches of Christ."²⁾ According to the proposed constitution some of the objectives are as follows: "to manifest the essential oneness of co-operating churches in spirit and purpose; to carry on such work of the churches as they desire to be done in co-operation rather than in separation; to encourage devotional fellowship and mutual counsel concerning the spiritual life and religious activities of the churches; to foster and encourage co-operation between two or more denominations."³⁾ The Council shall consist of the following four divisions: Church and Community, Christian Education, Home Missions, Foreign Missions. "Each division may establish and maintain direct relations with the denominational Board and Agencies corresponding to its field of operation, including those denominations which are not constituent members of the Council." There are to be interdivisional commissions, which will serve the four divisions in such areas as stewardship, evangelism, social and race relations, international justice and good will. We take this to mean, that, for instance, the commission on social and race relations may work out the philosophy and the procedures for the Division in Foreign or in Home Missions. The plan also provides for the establishment of Service Bureaus which will serve as outlets for official expression on all religious and moral, social and political questions within the community, the country, and the world through such media as the radio, the press, and other means of publicity. While not all of the eight agencies involved were ready to vote approval of the plan and to accept the proposed constitution, it seems very likely that the plan will be approved at the next convention in 1945.

What are the implications for our Church? According to the proposed plan, the various denominations and their respective boards will deal with the public and the Government through the Council as a recognized unit. Take the field of religious education. The trend toward introducing religious education in the public schools on a broad

2) Report of the Committee, p. 8.

3) Report, p. 10 f.

interdenominational platform is gaining momentum. Will this movement take on still greater proportions when the present International Council of Religious Education becomes part and parcel of the North American Council of Churches? Will Federal, State, and local school officials deal only with the three recognized church bodies, the North American Council, the Jewish bodies, and the Catholics, in determining the school's participation in religious training, or will we be able to have the Government recognize our Church as a fourth group, or will we have to line up with minorities which are not represented in any of the groups? The trend toward unionism is terrific at present. Such outstanding leaders as E. Stanley Jones advocate a union of all churches similar to our Federal union, i. e., all denominations would be no more than branches of the one Church, "The Church of Christ in America."⁴ How will our Board of Foreign Missions deal with our Government and with the governments in which our missions are located, if the Foreign Missions Conference becomes a functionary of the Federal Council? Will the Government recognize our Church and its program and grant our missionaries the necessary passports? Will the use of the radio for religious broadcasts ultimately come entirely under the domination of the successor to the Federal Council? These are some of the problems which agitate the minds of the leaders of our Church. May God help us to find such a solution that we shall be able to continue to do our work without compromising any of our doctrinal principles and without in any way diminishing our zeal in spreading the Gospel in these trying times.

F. E. M.

Two Councils Organized in Opposition to Federal Council.—Because the modernistic Federal Council has been accepted in wide circles as the official mouthpiece of the Protestant churches, the Fundamentalists have felt the necessity of an organization which would adequately represent those groups in the Protestant churches which could not subscribe to the program of the Federal Council. This led to the organization of the American Council of Christian Churches by the Rev. Carl McIntire of Collingwood, N. J., in 1941. Prominent among the original sponsoring committee besides Mr. McIntire were Dr. J. O. Buswell of the National Bible Institute; Mr. Ernst Gordon of the *Sunday School Times*; Dr. Wm. Houghton of the Moody Bible Institute. The purpose of the council is "to enable evangelical Christians to accomplish tasks that can better be done in co-operation than separately, including joint witness to the glorious grace of Christ the Savior and steadfast testimony to precious souls against denials or distortions of the historic Christian faith." A second purpose is to challenge the claim of the Federal Council of Churches that it speaks for all the Protestant churches, particularly in the field of religious broadcasting, and in making contacts with the various Government offices. The American Council points out very correctly that the Federal Council has monopolized the outlets for public expression on the question of Protestant faith and life in the interest of its social gospel and its soul-destroying Modernism. The American Council hopes to unite all Bible-believing Christians in an

4) *Christian Century*, Dec. 16, 1942, p. 1554 ff.

actively "militant pro-Gospel and anti-Modernist" council, which will speak for that part of the Protestant churches which does not support the program of the Federal Council, particularly its social gospel. The doctrinal basis follows: "The full truthfulness, inerrancy, and authority of the Bible, which is the Word of God; the holiness and love of the one sovereign God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; the true deity and sinless humanity of our Lord Jesus Christ, His virgin birth, His atoning death, 'the just for the unjust,' His bodily resurrection, His glorious coming again; salvation by grace through faith alone; the oneness in Christ of those He has redeemed with His own precious blood; and the maintenance in the visible Church of purity of life and doctrine." At the present time six communions numbering approximately 350,000 members constitute the American Council. *The Christian Beacon*, a weekly published by Mr. McIntire, and literature prepared by the executive secretary, Dr. Griffiths, contain the needed information.

The plans of the founders of the American Council to unite all Fundamentalists in one united council were blocked, when another group met in St. Louis April, 1942, and organized the National Association of Evangelicals for United Action. Whereas the American Council representatives at the St. Louis meeting demanded a clear-cut confession against the Federal Council, the sponsors of the new organization refused to take issue openly with the Federal Council. Men like Mr. McIntire and Dr. Griffiths belong to the group of Presbyterians who with Machen had fought Modernism in the Presbyterian Church and were finally expelled from this body because they had organized the Independent Board of Missions and refused to support financially the official Board which had sent out modernistic missionaries. But there are many Fundamentalists who have retained membership in the historic denominations in spite of the Modernism so rampant in these groups. These men could not see their way clear to condemn the Federal Council as long as their denominations retained membership in this body. Like the American Council the Evangelicals for United Action want to break the strangle hold of the Federal Council on all legitimate outlets for statements concerning Protestant thought. Like the American Council their membership is composed of Fundamentalists, many of whom are represented in the organization founded by Dr. W. D. Riley and known as the World's Christian Fundamentals. But the Evangelicals for United Action did not want to enter upon a militant antimodernist program.

If we interpret correctly the report published in book form and entitled *Evangelical Action*,¹⁾ the Evangelicals for United Action endeavored to avoid two clashes, the one with the Federal Council and the other with dissenting groups in their own midst. The fact is, of course, that the Federal Council does not determine the doctrinal position of any of its constituent members. But as long as the control of the Federal Council of Churches is in the hands of out-and-out Modernists, it will in reality be the organ of Modernism. Any organization which presumes to speak for that part of the Protestant Church which is Fundamentalist must of necessity denounce the Federal Council

1) Published by United Action Press, 160 pp. Price \$1.00.

by name and must openly declare its opposition to the attempt of the Federal Council to foist its social gospel upon the churches and to concern itself primarily with economic and political questions. The strangle hold which the Federal Council has at present on the Protestant churches cannot be broken by silence. (Mr. McIntire's testimony at Cleveland failed to receive recognition.) In the second place, the Evangelicals for United Action belong to those denominations which are now represented in the Federal Council. They are attempting to rally all those within these various denominations who are opposed to the Modernism within their respective groups. The sad spectacle of the Protestant churches is, of course, that the lines of cleavage run not only vertically but also horizontally. Any group or organization which attempts to bring together such divergent groups for united action must be planted on a rather broad and latitudinarian principle. In his opening address at the St. Louis meeting the chairman of the temporary committee, Rev. J. E. Wright, said: "We must not allow our fellowship with each other to founder upon the rocks of profitless controversy over issues which are relatively unimportant, except as a matter of our own conviction." He advocated a doctrinal basis along the lines of the broad doctrinal confessions of the Fundamental League, stressing the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible, the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the Vicarious Atonement, and the personal return of Christ. And Dr. Stephen Paine of Houghton College, recognizing the difficulty of uniting "Christians of strong convictions" on a common basis and warning against superorthodoxy as Satan's instrument, suggested that the Evangelicals for United Action must seek "some least common denominator upon which Bible-believing Christians can unite"; must "avoid questions of sectarian doctrine which are not necessarily involved in the orthodox evangelical stand"; and "must shun the spirit of controversy and opposition to existing organizations, even when we question their orthodoxy."²

The Association of Evangelicals for United Action was organized not so much to oppose the Federal Council, but to supplement its program. According to Dr. W. D. Ayer the Federal Council "is strong and competent in certain religious fields or religious activities, but does not represent the great body of evangelical Christians in faith and doctrine. . . . I would not deny the Federal Council its proper existence, but I feel that it does not represent me in many of its programs and pronouncements." This is the case particularly in the manner in which the Federal Council controls and uses the free radio time for religious broadcasts.³ Nor does the Federal Council represent adequately the churches in its dealings with the Government. Believing that the Government is becoming increasingly paternalistic and attempting to direct the activities of all phases of our national life and in this attempt is recognizing only three groups, the Catholic, Jew, and Protestant, it is necessary that the Protestant representation be not made exclusively through the Federal Council.

In the Preamble to its temporary constitution we read: "We propose to organize an association which shall give articulation and united voice

2) L. c., pp. 50, 59, 60.

3) P. 43.

to our faith and purposes in Christ Jesus." The constituent members (denominations, organizations, churches, or groups of churches) shall subscribe to the following doctrines: The inspiration and inerrancy of the Bible; the doctrine of the Trinity; the deity of Christ, the Incarnation, His sinless life, His miracles, His vicarious death, the Resurrection, the personal return in glory; the exceeding sinfulness of human nature and the necessity of regeneration; the resurrection of all, both to life and eternal damnation; the spiritual unity of all believers. The fields of endeavor are to be: evangelism; relations with the Government; national and local use of the radio; public relations; preservation of separation of Church and State; Christian education; freedom for home and foreign missions.⁴⁾ The Constitutional Convention is scheduled for April 27, 1943, to be held at Chicago. F. E. M.

Christian Ashrams.—Hulda Fritzemeier in the *Christian Advocate* (Oct. 1, 1942) reports on several Christian ashrams held this summer at various places in our country. We have had institutes, conferences, conventions, retreats, and now we are having ashrams. Names, of course, mean nothing in themselves, but what matters is whether they stand for things that can be approved or not. Ashrams, too, may be reformed and purified so that despite their outlandish name they stand for something which also Lutherans may hold. But as Hulda Fritzemeier describes the Christian ashrams that she attended, they stand for and express a type of sectarian enthusiasm which Lutherans cannot countenance. She writes: "As it originated in India, the ashram was a forest school where a spiritual preceptor, with his disciples, *would go aside in a disciplined search for fellowship with God*. When placed in a Christian context, the ashram differs from the conference and retreat in that, instead of trying to find verbal answers, it tries to produce in individuals and in the corporate life a miniature kingdom of God [italics our own]. The idea was introduced in this country six years ago by two missionaries returning from India, Maurice and Esther Ballinger. Since 1940 the ashrams have been sponsored by the Department of Evangelism of the Federal Council of Churches in America with Rev. E. Stanley Jones as the inspiration, teaching the technique. This past summer four American Christian ashrams were held, each lasting two weeks, at Occidental College, Los Angeles, Cal.; Blue Ridge, N. C.; Winnepesaukee, N. H.; and Lake Geneva, Wis. There was a total attendance of 800 persons representing most of the Protestant denominations. Dr. Jones spoke twice daily at each place. His latest book, probably to be titled *Abundant Living*, although still in manuscript form, was used in the morning meeting. Other speakers, each outstanding in some phase of religious work, composed the leadership group, each emphasizing the theme of the ashram, 'Christ is the Answer.' The motto, 'Unbreakably given to each other and unreservedly given to God,' is achieved in several ways. All titles are forgotten, and members are referred to as 'Brother George' or 'Sister Anna,' and all must work for an hour each day at some manual labor. The men paint, do carpenter and repair work, or repair the terraces. The women sew,

4) L. c., 101—115.

mend, knit for charitable organizations, or type. Each member is enrolled in one of the seminars which undertake to study particular problems confronting the Christian today. From nine o'clock in the evening until seven-thirty in the morning a period of silence is observed as a time to 'recharge one's spiritual batteries.' Once during the ashram an all-night prayer vigil is held in two-hour watches. There are also many hours of frank sharing of personal problems, with prayers for guidance and help. The whole program of the Christian ashram is planned to help the members catch the habits and spirit of the Kingdom so that they may carry this new light into their everyday living."

It is not difficult for a Lutheran to see why the ashram lends itself so easily to the use of liberal Calvinism and why it cannot be adopted in the form current among the Federal Council adherents in our own churches. Calvinism's basic principle that the Holy Spirit reacts upon the soul immediately and not through the divinely appointed means of grace has something in common with the fundamental principle of Hindu pantheism. Both can "recharge their spiritual batteries" (only they are not spiritual, and there is no charging that way) by periods of silence. Both can seek solace and strength in "all-night prayer vigils" (apart from what all Christians believe to be the efficacy of true prayer). They resemble each other also in their views of the "kingdom," which to both means nothing more than "brotherly living" or, more simply, "kind deeds" and "good works." Lutheranism with its emphasis on the spiritual nature of Christ's kingdom and on the objectivity of the appointed means of grace, the Word and the Sacraments, as the only *media salutis* by which to "recharge our spiritual batteries," would place into the center of the "ashram" the study of the Word of God as the only means of spiritual blessings and the only justifiable purpose of such conventions. But in that case the convention would not be an ashram! Both the pagan and the Federal Council ashrams are outbursts of antiscritptural enthusiasm.

J. T. M.

Parallels to Bible Precepts in the Religious and Moral Literature of the East.—Under this heading Dr. H. Hamann in the *Australasian Theological Review* (January to June, 1942; pp. 12 ff.) presents an interesting study of some of the "maxims of righteousness" taken from the sacred books of the ancient Hindus (e. g., the *Bhagavad-Gita*), which in some respects are similar to the moral precepts of the Holy Bible. A Buddhist beatitude, for example, reads: "To abhor and cease from sin, abstinence from strong drink, not to be weary in well-doing: these are the greatest blessing." (Cf. Gal. 6:9.) Hinduistic literature, moreover, knows of a "golden rule," teaching: "Do naught to others which if done to thee would cause thee pain; this is the sum of duty." Or: "A man obtains a proper rule of action by looking on his neighbor as himself." (Cf. Matt. 22:39.) Nevertheless, as Dr. Hamann writes in his concluding paragraph, "the unique moral grandeur of the Christian religion remains for all that." He says: "One thought leaps to the mind of all Christian readers who peruse these and other examples of Eastern morality and reflect on their occasional marked similarity to some Scripture precepts. How far from understanding Christian truth are all

they who find the essence of Christianity in the Golden Rule and the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount! If that were really the gist of Christ's message, we could not even call Him the unique moral teacher; for in that case He merely said a little better, somewhat more completely, a little more fully, what others said before and after Him. Then our blessed Savior is degraded to the position of a Buddhist sage or a moralizing Hindu philosopher; the Gospel is but an earlier *Gita*, and the *Gita*, the Gospel in Eastern dress. Another thought that will be suggested to all who have followed this little inquiry is that Christian preachers should beware of saying, whether in the pulpit or elsewhere, that specific maxims and rules of Christian morality are absolutely unique in the sense that they are found nowhere else. The unique moral grandeur of the Christian religion remains for all that. For the morality of the Bhagavad-Gita is not that of Hinduism generally, and the lofty precepts of early Buddhism do not represent ordinary Buddhist morality. The moral teachings of the Bible, however, are uniformly of the same high excellence and perfection, just because they are the moral law, the Law of God; they are, moreover, the holy and immutable will of God with respect to *all* men, and are therefore not intended for the select few, for the choice spirits who rise above the common level of humanity, but are meant for all and are binding upon all. Finally, a study of the best that pagan moralists could propound serves to give added emphasis to the quickening, vivifying, regenerating power of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. It is one thing to discover noble moral maxims, to frame beautiful rules of behavior; it is quite another thing to put them into practice. The most earnest sages could not follow their own counsels of perfection; and their teachings could not save Roman, Greek, Indian civilization from corruption. Neither, for that matter, can a mere repetition of moral precepts from the Bible save our Western civilization from decay. In whatever form the moral law—the divine Law—may be enjoined upon sinful man, he is simply incapable of true conformity to the Law and hence of true morality. Only the Gospel of Christ gives effect to the Law in all hearts that receive the message of salvation through sincere faith in the Savior. This is the special glory of the Gospel of Christ as far as the Law of God is concerned: *Lex praescribit, evangelium inscribit.* The article is directed especially against the statement made occasionally also in Lutheran pulpits that “the excellence and the essential truth of the Christian religion can be demonstrated by its superior moral teachings.” This argument, Professor Hamann admits, is of some value in apologetics; but those who think that pagan religion cannot produce any beautiful epitomes of personal morality or any noble precepts at all are treading on dangerous ground. The real difference between the teachings of Christianity and those of pagan cults lies in the points which are so strikingly summed up in the closing paragraph we quoted.

J. T. M.

How Does Compulsory Chapel Attendance Work?—A correspondence in the Christian Century from Canada states, “Sons and daughters of the Church now in military camps and training centers report, while on leave at their own home places of worship, that enforced church

attendance is viewed with disgust among the trainees. At the same time, despite the high quality of the chaplains, only from one to two per cent of military youth attends worship when attendance is voluntary." The difference between the broad way and the narrow way cannot be removed by force. One cannot make people Christians by compulsion.

A.

The Statement of the Roman Bishops.—In the *Christian Century* of December 2, 1942, a notable editorial appeared with the title "The Catholic Manifesto." This manifesto had the caption "Victory and Peace." It was issued by the Catholic bishops in November and was given a great deal of publicity. Its chief features were the declaration that the war which our country is waging now is a religious war, and some social and economic observations, such as a note of concern in view of "the unprecedented number of women in industry." The *Christian Century* admits that there is much in this manifesto which deserves approval and commendation, but it adds, "There can be no doubt that the Catholic Church is steadily gaining prestige in the political sphere of American life. Its strategy is shrewdly conceived and ably administered. The press, the radio, the movies, all play into its hand. Its grip on the educational process is becoming steadily stronger. Its relations with the Government—national, State, and local—are more comfortable and rewarding than at any time in our national history. The pseudo-ambassadorship of Myron Taylor to the Vatican has borne its desired fruit in the increase of Catholic prestige, even if nothing else has come of it. The Church has good reason to feel that it is well on the way toward a relation with the Government in which it will be entitled to make political demands in its own interest. This latest manifesto of the American hierarchy is a part of this strategy of accord. To read it without keeping this strategy in mind is to read it naively."

Comparing this position of the American bishops with attitudes assumed by Roman Catholic leaders elsewhere and at other times, the editorial says, "There is nothing new in this, for the Catholic Church has generally yielded its 'catholicity' to the claims of nationalism in countries which were at war with one another. But there is at the top of the hierarchy an authority which symbolizes the whole Church which is slow to take sides in an international war, which deplores a war and works for peace, and which waits until its own ecclesiastical interests are clearly known to be involved on one side or the other before it surrenders its catholic position. This is where the Papacy stands in this war. It vacillates between its hatred of Communism on one side and its failure to come to satisfactory terms with Hitler on the other. Moreover, it is not sure which side will win! So long as this uncertainty and apprehension exist concerning the side upon which its own ultimate interest lies, the Papacy maintains its neutrality and exhorts the faithful to pray for peace. Thus the Catholic Church is able to maintain the fiction of catholicity or ecumenicity while its national branches are allowed to fight on both sides of the conflict. What would not the United Nations give for a statement from the Vatican like that of the American prelates! How can these prelates make such a decisive decla-

ration as 'this conflict of principles makes compromise impossible,' while the Holy Father himself is vacillating and will continue to vacillate until he is satisfied which side is going to win?"

That the bishops' statement was not an unselfish effort to aid the cause of true patriotism is likewise brought out in this editorial. "The bishops and archbishops could not refrain from revealing their strategic motivation even in the text of their manifesto. The document reaches its climax in an implied but unconcealed reference to Protestant mission work in Latin America. On this subject the resentment of the hierarchy has been gaining in frankness of expression in recent years. . . . In the prelates' manifesto it is brought to focus in a fashion which clearly bids for Government favor in return for the hierarchy's support of the war. This appears in a subtle but unmistakable attempt to link the Catholic pretension to a monopoly of religion in Latin America with a 'good neighbor' policy of the American Government, which seeks to create a solidarity of all the democracies in this hemisphere. . . . The bishops are quite frank about it. They are conscious of having already secured such a privileged position at the center of America's political life—a position which they now hope to make more secure by imperceptibly blessing the nation's war (despite the Vatican's neutrality)—that they boldly suggest action by the national Government to restrain Protestant activity in Latin America, because it is 'disturbing international relations.' The strategy of their profession of patriotism comes unmistakably to the surface at this point. It is the strategy of *quid pro quo*, which reflects the policy of the hierarchy in every land where the Catholic Church is not established but is seeking establishment. The hierarchy has put the Church behind the Government in fighting the war; now let the Government make payment by putting pressure on Protestant missions to withdraw from South America, leaving that continent as an exclusive Catholic preserve. The bishops do not say this in so many words, but that is what they mean, and no careful reader of their manifesto can mistake it."

In the light of history, who will say that the *Christian Century* editor is going too far in his interpretation of the designs of the Roman Catholic hierarchy?
A.

The Federal Council and Rome's Claim to Exclusive Rights in South America.—The recent bold claim of the Roman hierarchy to all priority rights in South America and its complaint of "intrusion" by American Protestant missionaries as "a disturbing factor in our international relations" and "offensive to the dignity of our Southern brothers, their culture, and their religion" induced the Federal Council at its meeting in Cleveland to make a reply. However, instead of pointing to the spiritual neglect of the millions in South America by the Roman clergy and to the hopeless superstition which the Roman religionists have encouraged among their members, the Federal Council passed the following resolution: "It is with deep concern . . . that we have witnessed an effort now publicly endorsed in the U.S. by the archbishops and bishops of a sister Christian communion, which constitutes a religious minority in this country, to set the relation of Protestant Christianity to Hispanic America in a perspective which does violence both

to historical truth and contemporary fact. We deplore the pretension of the Roman Catholic hierarchy to circumscribe the religious freedom of Protestant Christians in the proclamation of their faith, while by implication reserving for themselves the right to the universal proclamation of their own." The resolution includes the following affirmations: The Federal Council will insist on the principle of religious liberty and the rights of religious minorities throughout the world; the churches will continue to avail themselves of the constitutional freedom which the republics of Hispanic America grant to the representatives of every faith; the Protestant institutions have been regarded favorably by the governments of South America; and lastly, the Protestant and Roman Catholic Christians should combine their influences in these critical days to work for religious freedom and to bear common testimony to the guiding principles of the Christian faith in relation to the postwar world. President Vargas of Brazil was reported by Dr. Howard to have said that he had two sons, one named Luther and the other Calvin, and that this indicated that he would not permit anything to handicap the Protestant missions.

F. E. M.

E. Stanley Jones on the Fellowship Question.—It is well known that E. Stanley Jones, prominent among missionaries in India, is an advocate of the union of all Christian churches. How utterly indifferent he is with respect to the teachings that divide the churches becomes apparent from a few sentences which we shall quote from an article of his in the *Christian Century* of December 16, 1942. "I am not interested in, in fact, I would oppose, any one church overtly or covertly trying to absorb the rest. In the first place, that will never happen; so the attempt might as well be given up. And if it did happen, it would lead to impoverishment, for no Church has the whole truth. The truth is in Christ, who is 'the Truth.' What we, as denominations, hold are varying approximations to Christ, who is the Truth beyond us all. We need, therefore, to pool denominational emphases so that the sum total may be a closer approximation to Him who is the Truth." Evidently Dr. Jones does not believe that his own denomination (the Methodist) is in possession of the whole truth. We pity the man who sails under a flag to which he cannot give wholehearted allegiance.

A.

Brief Items.—At a Public Education Association meeting in New York it was definitely stated that juvenile delinquency is on the increase. In a number of instances mothers of children are working on full-time jobs, often not returning till eight or nine o'clock in the evening, and one can easily visualize the disorganized state of their homes. The suggestion has been made that the schools should take charge of children during the time that the mothers are away.

In New York one meets the strange situation that bunco and similar games of chance are forbidden everywhere except in churches. The stipulation has been issued that if such things are carried on by churches, the people in charge have to be non-professionals. It has been discovered that professional promoters operated such affairs on a commission basis. The whole subject is unsavory and not to the credit of Christian churches.

The central problem which Japan presents . . . is religious. It grows out of the supposed divinity of the emperor. So long as the head of the State maintains his pretensions to godhood this claim creates a pool of absolute and irresponsible power which militarists will seek to control.—From an editorial in the *Christian Century*.

The distress in China beggars description. Among the gravest conditions now being made known are, first, terrible devastation wrought by the Japanese during their recent retreat from the provinces of Kiangsi and Chekiang, during which they systematically looted the towns and burned farm animals and implements; second, floods from the Yellow River, now announced to have killed 3,000 persons in one district and destroyed the homes of 40,000; third, famine in the provinces of Honan and Kwantung, threatening nine million people with starvation, with no relief in sight until next spring's harvests." This information is based on a report of the Church Committee for China Relief.

A strange educational situation obtains in Montreal. A correspondent of the *Christian Century* writes that "Seven thousand Jewish pupils are enrolled in Montreal Protestant schools, and taxes for this purpose are paid by their parents to the Montreal Protestant Board of School Commissioners." Evidently the Jewish people have to choose between Protestant and Catholic schools. We see here the difficulties existing in countries where Church and State are not kept separate.

Last fall the press stated that the oldest Protestant church in St. Louis is the First Presbyterian Church. It was founded with eight members November 15, 1817. The Catholic Church, of course, was the first one to establish itself in this city.

It is almost incredible how fast some of our large cities have grown in the last years. A report before us says that according to figures published by the Census Bureau in Washington, Detroit in the last two years has gained 336,000 inhabitants, Los Angeles 313,000, Washington 231,000, and Chicago 149,000. What mission fields!

At its meeting in Cleveland last December the Federal Council elected Bishop Henry St. George Tucker, presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church, as its president. He succeeds Dr. Luther Weigle. Evidently there is no doubt about Bishop Tucker's unionistic tendencies; otherwise he would not have been elected. It is worth noting that an Episcopalian prelate was elected to this position after the Episcopal Church has been in the Council not more than two years.

According to the religious press a prominent Protestant leader in Mexico belonging to the Northern Presbyterian missionaries, Robert A. Brown, has relinquished his post and retired from the work in the foreign field. His educational endeavors, according to press reports, will long be remembered both because prominent Mexicans received their preparatory training in a school of which he was the principal and because he interested himself definitely and successfully in the rural school problem of Mexico.

A.

Book Review

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

Jesus in the Light of History. By A. T. Olmstead, Professor of Oriental History, Oriental Institute, University of Chicago. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1942. 317 pages, 5½×8½. Price, \$2.75.

No one can turn one or two pages of this book without realizing that he is dealing with the production of an immensely learned scholar. Professor Olmstead is known for his *History of Assyria* and his *History of Palestine and Syria* and articles in various journals as well as for his work as teacher in the Oriental Institute in the University of Chicago. Throughout his career he has occupied himself with the history of the ancient Orient, and he possesses a most enviable amount of information on the Near East at and before the time of Christ. If any person is well qualified to examine and solve the chronological problems that confront us in the literature of the eastern part of the Mediterranean world in the classical age, our author is that person.

Dr. Olmstead can co-ordinate the historical data which we meet in an ancient writer with many other historical facts given in the literature of the respective time. We find him making use of the Old Testament, the Apocryphal literature of the Jews, the Talmud, rabbinical works, Josephus, Tacitus, and early Christian writers like Eusebius. At certain places we meet references to Babylonian writings that have come down to us.

With particular interest both the Old Testament and the New Testament student will read the description of Jerusalem found pp.56—93. Professor Olmstead has been on the spot and has himself investigated and can speak with authority on the questions pertaining to the various localities and scenes of the ministry of Jesus in the holy city.

When we come to examine Dr. Olmstead's views on Gospel criticism, we find that he courageously dissents from views which in many circles have come to be considered definitely established as resting on facts. According to his opinion John's Gospel is very early in its origin and is altogether reliable, and he follows its narrative very closely—a position which, as everybody knows, is the very opposite of the one which is in favor in critical New Testament circles today. He states that the discovery of the Chester Beatty Biblical Papyri II have shown that the late dates formerly assumed by critical scholars for the writing of the Synoptic Gospels cannot be held, but must be discarded in favor of earlier ones. (P.289 f.) A scrap of a manuscript of the Gospel of St. John coming from a year not later than 135 A.D. convincingly demonstrates, so he points out, that the assumption so common in critical circles today of a late date for its composition is wrong.

In what is most important we cannot agree with Dr. Olmstead, and that is in his view of the character of the Gospels and of our Lord. To him the Gospels are merely human productions containing errors,

and Jesus is the son of Joseph and Mary. (P.2.) The pre-suppositions of this book are entirely naturalistic. We are not surprised to see that off and on the old rationalistic interpretations for the explanation of miracles are employed. The account of the death of John the Baptist is colored by folklore. (P.131.) The episode in which Jesus is reported to have walked on the sea is to be viewed, so Dr. Olmstead thinks, not as including an actual walking of Jesus on the water. What happened was that Jesus walked by the sea and was approaching the boat. When the disciples wished to take Him into the boat, they at once were at the shore where they intended to disembark. (P.140.) According to our author, Jesus did not look upon Himself as the promised Messiah whom John had announced. (P.141.) At several places in John's Gospel Dr. Olmstead assumes there must be a gap, that is, something has been omitted.

As to the beginning of the ministry of Jesus, we find that Dr. Olmstead holds it occurred in December 28 A.D. This date, of course, makes the ministry of Jesus rather brief, giving it a duration of about one and one-third years. Most startling is the statement that he thinks Jesus was born about 20 B.C. He finds a foundation for this view in the words of the Jews addressed to Jesus (John 8:57), "Thou art not yet fifty years old and hast Thou seen Abraham?" It is very evident, however, that these words do not at all assert that Jesus was close to the age of fifty. They merely state that he was still a comparatively young man and yet made the claim of having seen Abraham, which to them seemed quite ridiculous. Dr. Olmstead argues that Jesus must have been about fifty years old, for otherwise he would not have been accepted by the people as a Prophet. No definite proof is offered for this strange view. The only thing that the author can point to is the custom of the Orient to show reverence to older people.

We have to say, then, in conclusion that while we admire the learning and the skill of Professor Olmstead and can well utilize many of the things which he places before us on the basis of his researches, we regret that he has remained outside the wicket gate and not entered the blessed realm where Jesus dwells as the great God and sin-atoning Savior.

W. ARNDT

A Creed for Free Men. A Study of Loyalties. By William Adams Brown. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 277 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$2.50.

Books by the scholarly Dr. Brown are worth studying. Not for the purpose of learning theology. Dr. Brown does not believe that the Bible is an infallible guide. He declares: "The Bible means to the Church today not simply what it meant to the men who wrote it. . . . Generation after generation has discovered meanings in its teachings of which its authors never dreamed. . . . It needs continual reinterpretation in the light of expanding experience 'and must not' be made a dogmatic textbook." (Pp. 212, 227, 230.) Nor does our author believe in the deity of Christ. "Christian faith sees in Jesus what science sees, a man like other men with human limitations both of body and spirit. But it sees more. It sees in him God's Word, a voice through which the eternal

God is saying to His children things which it is important for them to hear." (P. 181.) — Note the capital in "His" and the lower case "him." (The phrases: "The divinity of Jesus" [p. 260], "the man Jesus in whom God had become incarnate for the salvation of mankind" [p. 226], do not mean that Jesus is God, but that he is a great, a "divine" man.) Another statement to show that our book does not teach the Christian theology: "The central doctrine" of Christianity is that "of a personal God who has endowed men with freedom and summons them to brotherhood." (P. 164.) A final statement covering this point: "Nearly fifty years ago my old teacher Adolf Harnack used a sentence which has lingered in my memory ever since. He was lecturing to a class of university students upon the teaching of Jesus, and he took up the objection that Jesus had been greatly overrated as a teacher, because when followed to its source, there was nothing which he had said which *some one else had not said before*. 'Very true,' said Harnack, 'but think how many things they said that Jesus did not say.'" (P. 39. — Our italics.) Still, our book has some value. We are interested in knowing what solution of the various problems disturbing the social, political, and international economy Social Philosophy has to offer. We, the statesman and the layman, want to know the best answer which reason, operating with natural religion and with so much of Holy Scripture as it can accept, gives on the questions agitating the social and political world. Dr. Brown answers them, on the whole, acceptably. His wide reading, his knowledge of social psychology, keen analysis of the present situation, and calm judgment has produced a valuable contribution to the "democratic philosophy of life." This is the first article in his Creed for Free Men: "There is something in each human individual which gives him a value which society is bound to respect." "The second article in the democrat's creed is that each individual owes a duty to society. . . . A third article in the democrat's creed is that men, as we see them today, are imperfect and therefore need discipline. . . . A fourth article in the democrat's creed is that however imperfect men are, they are capable of becoming better and that the most effective way to help them to be better is to show that you trust them." (P. 182 ff.) We note, of course, that this betterment takes place only in the sphere of natural religion. And we note further that these findings, being based on natural reasoning, do not possess absolute certainty. They do not constitute a "creed," in the strict sense. Our author himself says: "In these days of triumphant science, where the discoveries of yesterday become the commonplaces of today, it is hard to be certain of anything. . . . Nowhere does the attempt to reach a satisfying creed seem more hopeless than when we consider man himself. . . . Still the search for a satisfying philosophy goes on." (Pp. 8, 32, 38.)

We submit a few more noteworthy statements: "There is a tendency in liberal circles to identify the cause of Christianity with that of political democracy. But Christianity is a very old religion and has found it possible in the course of its history to live at peace with many kinds of political philosophy." Again: "What we know as modern democracy owes its inspiration in no small measure to this new contact with an old book." (Pp. 164, 229.) — "A layman may not decide how far the com-

prehensive generalizations which are put forth from time to time by specialists fall within the legitimate domain of science or are in fact an excursion into the field of philosophy." We take it that this is a diplomatic way of saying that much of what is palmed off as science is simply guesswork. Again: "As we follow the scientist in these higher and more difficult parts of his research, we find that the number of questions increases to which he can give us no certain answer." (P. 52 f.) — "Nor can even reason promise the certainty we seek. . . . There are the so-called arguments for the existence of God. The name is a misnomer. One cannot prove by any argument that God exists. For God is the major premise from which all proof must start. The most that reason can do is to translate into the technical language of the schools certain very simple considerations which in every age have made it easier for men to believe in God than to disbelieve in Him." (P. 178.) — "They have learned how easy it is to arouse the enthusiasm of the crowd by a catchword. They know that, however improbable a statement may be, you have only to repeat it often enough, and you will find people to believe that it must be true." (P. 34.) — Here is a particularly fine gem: "In an essay on the ideal teacher the late Professor George Herbert Palmer of Harvard has described some of the qualities which make the true teacher a typical democrat. First, he tells us, a teacher must have an aptitude for vicariousness; second, an already accumulated wealth; third, an ability to invigorate life through knowledge; and fourth, a readiness to be forgotten. Professor Palmer goes on to explain what he means by these somewhat cryptic attributes. By a talent for vicariousness he means that the teacher must find his larger satisfaction not in what he does himself in the world of scholarship, but in what he helps his students to accomplish; by accumulated wealth he designates the store of wisdom which the teacher has acquired by long association with the scholars who have preceded him; by an ability to invigorate life through knowledge he means that he must think of the truths which he tries to share not as abstract propositions existing in their own right, but as convictions which when appropriated may vitalize and transform character; and finally by readiness to be forgotten — the teacher's ultimate virtue — he means that willingness to lose self in the life of others." . . . (P. 189.)

The book is valuable for another reason. It exemplifies the aims and methods of unionism. "Christianity provides a religious basis for a fellowship of the democratic type better than any other existing religion. For more than a generation Christians have been making experiments in Christian fellowship and have made the surprising discovery that in the measure that they were frank in the recognition of their differences they have been able to appreciate the extent of their agreements." On the basis of this partial agreement the unionists hope to establish "the fellowship of men of good will in every land," embracing Rome, the liberals of every description, Jews and heathen. "Such organizations as the National Conference of Christians and Jews and the World Parliament of Religions show that beneath all differences there are common experiences and convictions which make spiritual fellowship possible." The unionists appeal to Christ's example. "He found

striking examples of faith in those of other race and creed — the Roman centurion, the Syrophoenician woman. Faith in the Father God is not confined to the so-called theistic religions." And the unionists operate with dishonest formulas of agreement. "The World Council of Churches is a fellowship open to all Churches which accept Jesus Christ as God and Savior, each Church being the judge of the meaning it puts into these words." Is it possible that men would openly advocate the use of ambiguous formulas of union? That church bodies would accept a document as a basis of agreement which permits different interpretations and let "each Church be the judge of the meaning it puts into these words"? And if such a document cannot be manufactured, dispense with all creedal limitations. "One of the articles of the constitution of the World Council provides for the calling of world conferences without creedal limitation in which all who believe in the brotherhood of man and wish to co-operate in realizing a world-wide fellowship may be included." (Pp. 164, 165, 167, 250, 252, 257.)

TH. ENGELDER

Our Lady, Mediatrix of All Graces. By Raphael V. O'Connell, S.J. John Murphy Company, Baltimore. 121 pages, 5×7½. Price, \$1.00.

Mary in Her Scapular Promise. By John Mathias Haffert. The Scapular Press, Sea Isle City, N.J. 249 pages, 5½×8. Price, \$2.50. (Available also in a 50 cent paper cover edition.)

We purposely place these two books side by side for review, since we here have a revelation of actual conditions within the Roman Catholic sect indicating just how far this Church has gone in substituting Mary for Christ. The reader who has a complete file of the *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY* is referred to two articles which have appeared: "Maria Mediatrix Omnium Gratiarum," IV:881—889, and "The Progressive Revelation of the Antichrist," XIII, 120—136. The two books lying before us furnish the most comprehensive and incontrovertible evidence for the correctness of the conclusions drawn from the publications of Roman Catholic magazines and printing establishments. Both these books bear the *Imprimatur* of Catholic prelates, the first that of the Archbishop of Baltimore, the second that of the Bishop of Camden. If any theologian of any Protestant body still has doubts regarding the Papacy with its earthly head as the Antichrist *kat'exochen*, as clearly delineated in various parts of Holy Scripture, he is hereby earnestly urged to procure copies of these books and read for himself. The very Table of Contents tells a story which seems almost unbelievable, for these are its chapter headings: Mary, a New and Better Eve; Mary and the First Good Tidings; Mary Co-operatrix in the Redemption; Mary's Co-operation a Direct Concurrence in the Work of Redemption; Mary, Our Mother; Foundation of Mary's Spiritual Motherhood—1. Merit of the Divine Maternity, 2. Consent to the Incarnation, 3. Union with Christ on Calvary; Mary, Mother of Divine Grace; Mary, Our Mediatrix; Mary, Mediatrix of Grace—1. Acquisition of Grace, 2. Distribution of Grace; The Universal Mediation of Mary; What Is Meant by "All Graces"? To Whom Does Mary's Mediation Extend; The Church at Mary's Feet; In What Mary's Mediation Consists; Degree of Certainty of What Pre-

cedes; Devotion to Our Lady. As one peruses this book, it is quite impossible to escape the impression of blasphemous statements, which occur again and again on its pages. Of course, the Messianic promise Gen. 3:15 is retained in the false translation: She shall bruise thy head. Then we find such sentences as the following: "It might appear, then, that Mary's co-operation in the redemption of mankind was purely remote or indirect. She was the mother of the Redeemer, but, further than that, she had nothing to do with the work of redemption itself. Such would seem to be the correct statement of the Protestant view. But it is far from being the traditional view of the Catholic Church, as enshrined in her liturgy, in the teaching of the Fathers, and in the hearts of her children everywhere. The language of her great doctors would seem indeed to be gross exaggeration, unless it be interpreted as embodying the idea which they had of the co-operation of our Lady in the work of redemption as a whole; that is to say, of Mary's part not merely in the mystery of the Incarnation considered by itself alone, but in that mystery regarded as the first necessary step in the affair of the salvation of mankind." (P.29 f.) A statement ascribed to St. Germanus of Constantinople is quoted with approval: "O Virgin Mother of God, man was rendered spiritual when the Holy Ghost came down upon thee, as upon His temple. No one, O most holy, is filled with the knowledge of God, unless through thee; no one, O Virgin Mother, escapes from death, unless through thee; no one is ransomed, unless through thee; no one receives the benefit of mercy, unless through thee; through thee, who hast deserved to enfold God within thee!" (P.38.) "The Incarnation looked forward to the Passion as to the condition of our ransom, and the Son of God became man that we might have life through His death. That, in fact, was why Mary's consent was needed, and why God left it to her free choice to say whether or not she would accept a dignity involving so great a sacrifice." (P.52.) "The idea that is current everywhere among the faithful represents Mary as at every moment interesting herself in our behalf in heaven, and procuring for us by her actual intercession all the graces whereby we hope to attain salvation." (P.76.) "She is the *breath* of Christians, the *root* of liberty, restored by her to the human race. Better still, she is the *cause* of *salvation*, the mother of universal salvation, the salvation of the world, the salvation of all men even to the ends of the earth. She is the *common source* of our happiness, of our renovation, in a word of all blessings; the *repairer* and *restorer* of the human family, the *redemption* of mortals: through whom we have passed from death to life, from darkness to wonderful light. She is the *royal bridge* uniting heaven and earth, the *hope* of Christians, and their *only hope*; our refuge and our strength." (P.78.) And so we could multiply excerpts showing the unbelievable blindness of the author and of all those who follow him in his false doctrines concerning Mary.

But if we are shocked by such expositions, we are completely dumb-founded when we read, in the second of the books listed above, that all those who wear the brown scapular of the friars connected with the Carmelite order are given this assurance: "Receive, my beloved son, this habit of thy order: this shall be to thee and to all Carmelites a

privilege, THAT WHOSOEVER DIES CLOTHED IN THIS SHALL NEVER SUFFER ETERNAL FIRE." (P. 10.) The history of the scapular is then given, with a description of the various modifications which the garment (?) has undergone, especially through the legislation of Pius X, in 1910. In the later discussion of the merits of the scapular we find statements like the following: "Thus the Scapular is not only an assurance of salvation after death, it is even now a powerful means of grace. In instituting such a simple but complete devotion, Mary continually binds herself, as it were, to intercede for us. Truly, then, is the Scapular her sacrament: it is a visible pledge of her intercession, the very channel of grace." (P. 56.) "The whole meaning of the Scapular derives from this, Mary's gift of herself to us in the words of its promise. When she descends, surrounded by the pomp of heaven, to say that whosoever dies under her mantle shall be saved, does she not clearly mean that while she has brought us all forth to divine life in the pain of her Son's crucifixion, she has come down mystically to retake us into her womb that she may bring us forth at death to an eternal life?" (P. 112 f.) There are passages much more amazing than these, for we have an entire chapter devoted to the discussion "The Promise Extended into Purgatory," another on "Mary, Our Way." It is clear, from books and articles like these, as they are now appearing in increasing numbers from the pen of Roman Catholic writers, that the way is being prepared, not only for bolder declarations in the field of superstition and idolatry, but actually for the substitution of Mary for Christ in the work of atonement and for her practical deification. This is what O'Connell says in the preface of his book: "Recently a very important step was taken by the Holy Father in the appointment of a special commission of theologians, with three branches, one to sit in Rome, another in Belgium, and a third in Spain, whose duty it should be to examine the question maturely and from every angle, and to give their verdict as to whether or not the *universal mediation* of our Lady is capable of being defined as a dogma of faith." (P. 8.) We have already pointed out that this dogma will undoubtedly be promulgated together with that of the assumption of Mary, which has, in effect, been a doctrine of the Roman Church for centuries. There is a section in every library commonly headed Mariology. This shall have to be changed to read "Mariolatry." *Ceterum censeo Papam verum Antichristum esse.*

P. E. KRETZMANN

Proceedings of the Sixty-Third Convention of the Eastern District.
Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1942. 100 pages,
5½×8½. Price, 26 cents.

Proceedings of the Nineteenth Convention of the South Wisconsin District. 50 pages, 5½×8½. Price, 11 cents.

Proceedings of the Sixty-Third Convention of the Western District.
63 pages, 5½×8½. Price, 18 cents.

Here are three really worth-while reports. In the *Proceedings of the Eastern District* an essay by Pastor H. Meier on "Congregational Life in Apostolic Times" is published. The essayist presents the Scriptural

doctrine under the following heads: I. Local Congregations, II. The Public Ministry, III. Public Worship, IV. Christian Beneficence, V. Church Discipline, VI. Missions, VII. The Christians and the World. The lessons of Scripture are constantly applied to our time and day in a very practical and profitable manner. We would like to call the attention of our readers to the following resolutions of the Eastern District. On page 83 we read: "The following suggestions of the Teachers' Conference were accepted: 1. That more Kodachrome pictures, similar to those made under the direction of our Executive Secretary, but pertaining to Christian education in our District, be made as soon as possible. 2. That the Executive Secretary be commended for bringing the matter of Christian education to the people in the course of his illustrated lectures and that he be encouraged to do so in even greater measure in the future." On page 97 the question is asked: "Should not the church make some provision for children of families in which the husband is called to the colors while the wife has been "drafted" in civic service? The committee to which this matter was referred brought in the following recommendations: 1. That our Eastern District take the initiative in making plans for the care of these children during the periods of the day when the mothers must be absent from the home. 2. That the President of the District appoint a committee 'for the duration' to study the question thoroughly and to offer suggestions to the congregations of the District. 3. That all congregations of the District be urged to make a study of this question in their own particular community and to make adequate preparations for the eventual care of such children, either individually or conjointly with neighboring congregations. 4. That all congregations take advantage of every mission opportunity that may present itself also in this line of work."

The report of the South Wisconsin District offers a paper by Pastor Th. Gohlke on "The Relation of Sanctification to Justification and Its Implications," the first two sections of which had been read at the convention in 1940. On pages 40 to 43 the mode of procedure at elections is published which was adopted by the convention. "With a few exceptions the report contains the old approved mode of elections done into English." The District has found that its business was facilitated by the mimeographing of the important reports to be considered by the convention to such an extent that it resolved that "henceforth all important reports and memorials which are to be considered by the convention be mimeographed and placed into the hands of our delegates." P. 47.

In the report of the Western District *Proceedings* a brief abstract of a paper by Pastor Virtus Gloe on "The Church's Ministry of Mercy" is published on pages 13 and 14, and another essay by Pastor L. Dippold, also in abridged form, on "The Importance of Holy Baptism for Our Christian Life," pages 15 to 33. The report on Young People's Work stressed particularly the need of training our young people for active service in the congregation and the church at large. TH. LAETSCH